DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 032 24 TE 499 854

AUTHOR	Carlsen, James C.; And Others
TITLE	Preconference Educational Research Training Program in Music Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Music Educational Research Council, Washington, D.C.; Music Educators National Conference, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-0117
PUB DATE	28 Jan 70
GRANT	OEG-0-9-180117-2443(010)
NOTE	70p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.60
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Objectives, *Curriculum Development, Curriculum Planning, *Educational Objectives, *Educational Programs, Music, Music Activities, Music Appreciation, *Music Education, Music Teachers, *Research, Research Projects, Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

The Music Educators National Conference sponsored a 3-day intensive research training program in 1969 to prepare participants for research in curriculum development and evaluation. Major objectives of the program, in which 222 music educators participated, were to train each participant to be able to (1) write an educationally useful statement of each of the significant kinds of musical behaviors which might be cultivated through education; (2) identify the component parts of a musical behavior required for its operation at a given level of proficiency; and (3) prepare statements of instructional objectives for given levels of competence in specified musical behaviors. Training sessions--lectures supported by overhead transparencies, study of prepared instructional materials, and panel presentations--were preceded and followed by tests which revealed that participants improved in ability to state musical behaviors in selected categories and to identify component parts of musical behaviors. Significant shifts of attitude by participants about the subject matter of the sessions were also revealed. (Seventeen tables concerning the background, abilities, attitudes, evaluations, and recommendations of participants are included.) (Author/JM)

BR 9-0117
PA24

ED041032

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-0117
Grant No. OEG-0-9-180117-2443(010)

Preconference Educational Research Training Program in Music Education

James C. Carlsen, Robert L. Lathrop and Charles O. Moody

Music Education Research Council

Music Educators National Conference
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

January 28, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TE 499 854

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary Page 1
II. Introduction Page 2
III. Methods and Procedures Page 3
  A. Instructional Content Page 3
  B. Basic Instructional Schedule Page 4
  C. Cybernetic Nature of Sessions Page 4
  D. Selection Process Page 5
  E. Description of Participants Page 6
  F. Development and Analysis of the Evaluation Instruments Page 9
IV. Findings and Analysis Page 9
  A. Changes in Information About Behaviorally Stated Objectives Page 9
  B. Changes in Attitudes Toward Behavioral Objectives Page 16
  C. Participants' Goals and Recommendations Page 21
  D. In Summary Page 23
V. Conclusions and Recommendations Page 24
  A. Summary of Significant Findings Based Upon the Data Page 24
  B. Staff Conclusions Not Based on Pre - Post Test Data Page 24
  C. Recommendations Page 25
Appendices
  Appendix A-1 - Staff of Preconference Project Page 28
  Appendix A-2 - Participants in Preconference Project Page 29
  Appendix A-3 - Location and Schedule of Preconferences Page 35
  Appendix A-4 - Work Program for Preconference Page 36
  Appendix B-1 - Information Announcement Page 47
  Appendix B-2 - Invitation to Apply Page 50
  Appendix B-2a - Information Sheet for Application Page 51
  Appendix B-3 - Application (one of six) Page 53
  Appendix B-4 - Participant Notification Page 55
  Appendix B-4a - Information Sheet for Participants Page 56
  Appendix B-5 - Rejection Notice Page 57
  Appendix C-1 - Pretest Information Page 58
  Appendix C-2 - Posttest Information Page 63

LIST OF TABLES

Table I - Professional Responsibilities of Participants Page 6
Table II - Years of Postbaccalaureate Professional Experience in Music Education Page 7
Table III - Number of Courses Concerned with Curriculum Planning Taken by the Participants Page 7
Table IV - Participants' Prior Experience With Behavioral Objectives Page 8
Table V - Participants' Reasons for Attending Training Session Page 8
Table VI - Identification of Behavioral Objective Statements Page 10
Table VIIa - Participants' Ability to Write Examples of Type I Behavioral Statements (Covert, Nonverbal, Cognitive Affective) Page 11
Table VIIb - Participants' Ability to Write Examples of Type II Behavioral Statements (Overt, Verbal) Page 12
Table VIIc - Participants' Ability to Write Examples of Type III Behavioral Statements (Overt, Nonverbal) Page 12
Table VIId - Participants' Ability to Write Examples of Behavioral Statements--Totals Page 13
Table VIIIa - Evaluation of Participants' Definitions of the Concept, Behavior Page 14
Table VIIIb - Evaluation of Participants' Definitions of the Concept, Learning Page 14
Table VIIIc - Evaluation of Participants' Definitions of the Concept, Cybernetic Cycle Page 14
Table IX - Evaluation of Participants' Examples of "In-Life" Models Page 15
Table X - Participants' Beliefs Regarding Value of Behavioral Objectives Page 16
Table XI - Participants' Attitudinal Shifts Regarding the Usefulness of Behavioral Objectives for Musical Learning Page 17
Table XII - Participants' Attitudinal Shifts Regarding the Need for Stating Learning Outcomes in Behavioral Terms When Engaged in Instructional Planning Page 18
Table XIII - Participants' Attitudinal Shifts Regarding Teaching and Learning Page 19
Table XIV - Participants' Attitudes Toward In-School Music Programs and Out-of-School Music Experiences Page 20
Table XV - Participants' Views Concerning Experience and Learning of Musical Concepts Page 21
Table XVI - Participants' Views Regarding the Extent to Which Their Objectives for Attending the Conference Were Achieved Page 22
Table XVII - Recommendations Based on Experiences in Training Session Page 23

I. Summary

The 1969 Preconference Educational Research Training Program in Music Education (RTP) sponsored and conducted by the Music Education Research Council of the Music Educators National Conference provided three days of intensive research training in conjunction with the six regular regional biennial conventions of the organization. Five of the six training sessions were conducted immediately preceding regional conferences; the sixth was conducted immediately following the conference. A total of two hundred and twenty two music educators participated in the six training sessions.

The principal purpose of the RTP activity was to provide training in expressing the instructional objectives of music education for research in curriculum development and evaluation. Because relatively little research has been directed to the identification of musical behaviors and the expression of such identified behaviors in operational terms, these major emphases of the training activity were planned to provide music educators with an improved capability for developing operational objectives in research and instruction. The training program was designed to provide initial introduction to the background and problems of the subject and enough performance experience to provide each participant a basis for continuing self-development at the conclusion of the preconference experience. The major specific objectives of the program were to train each participant to be able to:

a. write an educationally useful statement of each of the significant kinds of musical behaviors which might be cultivated through education,

b. identify the component parts of a musical behavior required for its operation at a given level of proficiency,

c. prepare statements of instructional objectives for given levels of competence in specified musical behaviors.

Input at the training sessions consisted of lecture supported with overhead transparencies study of prepared instructional materials and panel presentations. About half of the instructional time was spent on individual and group practice in preparing behavioral statements, reviewing participant prepared statements and group discussion. Evidence obtained from pre and post test measures of participants demonstrated a substantial improvement in the ability to write educationally useful statements of musical behaviors in the behavior categories selected for study. Almost 85 percent of the participants demonstrated development of minimum competency in identifying component parts of musical behaviors. Other evidence indicated significant shifts of attitude by participants about the subject matter of the training sessions. It is strongly recommended that a second preconference training activity take place to provide needed additional experience in the application of knowledge and skills developed during these training activities to the purpose of preparing more effective statements of instructional objectives.

II. INTRODUCTION

Measurement of achievement of the anticipated outcomes of music education has presented a very knotty problem for researchers and practitioners in the field. Many objectives of instruction in the arts focus on development of increased proficiency in the performance of selected psychomotor skills. Student performance has been evaluated in the past by skilled judges, adjudicators, who rate performers and performing groups at competitions such as music contests and festivals. Individual teachers evaluate performance of their own students in similar ways. Much of the anticipated outcome of music education is represented by what the noted learning theorist, Abraham Maslow of Brandeis University, has called "transcendental experience." Since such experience is highly personalized, internalized and affective, it is exceedingly difficult to establish terminal behavioral objectives and/or performance criteria without which the development of measuring instruments is exceedingly difficult. The creation of such behavioral statements involves the identification of the desired musical behavior, an analysis of its significant components and a determination of the desired proficiency level to be demonstrated.

The interest in stating the anticipated outcomes of instruction in behavioral terms is wide-spread in education. The activity described in this report was a program designed to provide an intensive short-term training experience for a selected group of researchers, trainers of researchers and utilizers of research in music education. Six groups of thirty-two to fifty participants, a total of 222, took part in one of the six three-day pre-conference Research Training Programs held in conjunction with the six regional biennial conventions of the Music Educators National Conference between late January and late April, 1969. The majority of participants were college and university faculty and graduate students. In addition a number of state supervisors of music, school system music supervisors and curriculum specialists and classroom music teachers were included in the participant groups. A more detailed description of participants will be found in Part III-e of this report. The members of the Research Training Program staff are identified in Appendix A-1. All of the participants are listed in Appendix A-2 according to the particular Research Training Program pre-conference in which they participated. The dates and locations of each of the pre-conferences are listed in Appendix A-3.

The principal purpose of the training pre-conferences was to provide the participants with the means for identifying and stating effectively in behavioral terms the instructional objectives of music education for purposes of research in curriculum development and evaluation. It was established that the stated purpose would be best served by providing the experience for both researchers and those who should be utilizing the findings in application in the schools. The pre-conferences provided the opportunity to identify and train a select group which could profit uniquely from the training experience. The major objective of the training was to be a demonstrated proficiency in expressing instructional objectives of music education. The terminal behaviors anticipated as a result of the instructional are described in the following specific objectives:

a. To be able to write an educationally useful statement of each of the significant kinds of musical behaviors which might be cultivated through education.

b. To be able to identify the component parts of a musical behavior (the concepts, values, proficiencies, etc.) required for its operation at a given level of proficiency.

c. To be able to prepare statements of instructional objectives for given levels of competance is specified musical behaviors to serve as referents for their research in curriculum development and evaluation.

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A. Instructional Content

The institute was designed to implement an instructional model in which learners are engaged in a continuing series of in-life musical behaviors, under conditions which promote the acquisition of important musical concepts and skills. Each behavior, to maintain the forces which shape behavior so powerfully in life, to be set up as the pursuit of some end product which has want-serving value to the learner, such as a new competence, a specific performance, a critical response, a musical decision, and so on.

The institute participants were supplied in advance with three documents bearing directly on the work to be done in the institutes. They were then let through an analytical production process of four major steps, each of which was guided by a worksheet with additional instructional input appropriate to it.

Worksheet 1 was used for identifying a specific musical product a student might wish to produce, and stating it as an in-life behavior, with any desired criteria for the end result.

Worksheet 2 was a job analysis of the production behavior, in three parts: (a) steps by which the end product could be achieved, (b) identification of the various musical objects, processes, or other phenomena to be used or otherwise manupulated at any point in those steps, and (c) identification of any motor skills required in the steps.

The steps then became the plan of procedure for the learners task.

Worksheet 3 subjected goals, musical object, process, or other phenomenon identified in Worksheet 2, to an analysis of identification of its critical properties for conceptual learning of them. It also included identification of learning materials and experiences for that conceptual learning, and the writing of verbal and/or non-verbal behavioral tests of the conceptual learning. Each Worksheet 3 thus became a single concept learning plan.

Worksheet 4 subjected each required motor skill to analysis of its critical pattern and essential criterion level for a single-skill development plan with a behavioral statement for evaluation.

After the instructional model was thus developed, the whole instructional packet was put into a cybernetic framework portraying instruction itself as a production process beginning with a specified end product, going through goal-specific production step to a product which is then subjected to measurement against the specifications of the goal, with evaluative feedbacks affecting both the learner's immediate behavior, and the instructional process itself. Thus the goals identified in Worksheet 1 became the dependent variables, and the means identified in Worksheets 2, 3, and 4 became the independent variables for a continuous quality-control type of research in curriculum and instruction as an integral part of the educative process.

A summary outline showing the organization of the content in the program of each pre-conference is included in Appendix A-4. Each day's activity during the pre-conference included three different aspects of participant involvement; presentation of new information, discussion, review and response to new input and individual practice in producing analyses, behavioral statements and similar written products for critical review by staff and other participants.

B. Basic Instructional Table

	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 3
A.M.	Introductory remarks Pretest Summary of purposes, organization, and underlying assumptions Initial substantive input	Review of Worksheet 1 Introduction of Worksheet 2 Practice Session (Worksheet 2) Group Review of materials developed during practice session	Review of Worksheet 3 Introduction of Worksheet 4 Practice Session (Worksheet 4) Group review of materials developed during practice session
P.M.	Introduction of Worksheet 1 Practice Session (Worksheet 1) Group review of materials developed during practice session	Review of Worksheet 2 Introduction of Worksheet 3 Practice Session (Worksheet 3) Group review of materials developed during practive session	Review of Worksheet 4 Review of Entire Sequence Suggestions to Participants concerning follow-up Closing remarks Posttest

C. Cybernetic Nature of Sessions

Numbers of variations in the organization of the program were introduced in response to in-course evaluation by the staff. It was anticipated initially that the first pre-conference was to be a trial since no previous trial opportunity was possible. The review and evaluation which followed immediately upon the conclusion of the first pre-conference resulted in a number of important changes in the organization and operation of the pre-conference program including the following:

1. The initial sequence for presentation of conceptual material was reorganized to involve participants in practice activities earlier in the program.
2. The description of the general educational development system was deferred until the second day to reduce the initial input load and to provide the input at a point in the activity when participants had a greater need to have that information.
3. The practice pattern was changed from a team approach to the work sheets to an individual approach in order to provide greater individual participation and a more effective use of practice time and opportunity.

A number of other changes having somewhat less significance overall lead to the development of new instructional materials by members of the staff.

The RTP staff believes that the circulation of staff members from one pre-conference to the next and, particularly, the critical review and evaluation that went on during and after each pre-conference led to the operational development and application of a functionally effective cybernetic system. While there was an initial anticipation of the cybernetic possibility and some deliberate attempt to plan for it based upon the experience of the principal instructor in a pattern of similar activity involving the art educators Research Training Project during the previous year, the degree to which the cybernetic system became functionally effective and significant exceeded the expectation of the staff and appears to have considerable potential significance for the development of similar educational and training programs in the future.

D. Selection Process

An informational letter describing the proposed Project was sent to each of the more than 7,000 members of the Society for Research in Music Education. This initial mailing elicited more than 500 responses from individuals expressing an interest in participating in the proposed RTP's. Individuals were encouraged to participate as members of teams, each team to consist of three to five members. Teams might include a music teacher in the schools, a music supervisor, and/or experienced graduate student in music education, and a college or university music researcher. Individuals unable to identify with a team were encouraged to participate individually with the understanding that the Participant Selection Committee would assign them to a team. The Participant Selection Committee consisted of the six Division pre-conference directors and the Project Coordinator.

Only when funding of the RTP by Office of Education was obtained, was it possible to actively engage in the selection process. A second letter including an application form, was sent to those who had earlier indicated an interest in participating. The total number of applications received was 278 and it was from this group that participants and alternates were selected. It was not possible to accept every applicant because the total number of participants was not to exceed 240, with a maximum of 40 at each of the six training sessions.

The principal criteria for selection were as follows:

a. That individuals can be composed into a team which has a substantial likelihood of continuing to develop curricular and evaluative material as a small group after the Pre-conference ends.

b. That teams consist of individuals who give clear evidence of being able to profit most from the training experience.

c. That teams represent an appropriate geographic and demographic distribution.

The Music Education Research Council established the following additional factors as criteria for selection, listed in rank order of applicability, to further facilitate the selection process:

a. Active researcher (college or university professor).

b. State supervisor

c. Supervisor of Music - City or County

d. Geographic Distribution

e. Teaching area of Specialization

The selection of participants and alternates for each of the six RTP's was carried forward by the appropriate Division Pre-conference director and the Project Coordinator who conferred with available MERC members from that particular division when additional information was needed. Copies of all correspondence and materials are included in Appendix B.

E. Description of Participants

The following data were obtained from pretest and posttest responses of 222 participants in the Research Training Project (RTP) conducted in connection with the six 1969 MENC Regional Conferences. The first session, which also had the largest number of participants attending any one preconference session was held in Washington, D.C. (N=50). The other sessions in chronological order were held in St. Louis, Missouri (N=40); Eugene, Oregon (N=31); Honolulu, Hawaii (N=32); Mobile, Alabama (N=37); and Fargo, North Dakota (N=32).

As a group the participants came from all levels of instruction, first grade to graduate school, and from all types of responsibilities within the music programs of their institutions (See Table I).The reader will note the largest representation came from college faculty members and graduate students (N=134). The largest instructional responsibility came from persons involved in training teachers (N=167) although classroom teachers in various music specialties were well represented. Because of the dual responsibilities of several participants, row and column totals exceed 222 (the total number of respondents). Due to the presence of dual reporting of responsibilities no attempt was made to interpret cross-classifications

TABLE I

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS

					Program Involvement			
Level of Responsibility	N	Vocal	Instrumental	Theory History Appreciation	Administration	Teacher Training	Graduate Student	Other
1-6	41	28	10	10	16	15	7	7
1-8	26	18	10	8	10	10	4	5
7-9	42	22	15	15	19	11	6	7
9-12	47	23	22	20	22	12	11	5
College	134	40	32	24	36	111	56	23
Other [1]	21	4	3	3	10	8	8	5
Totals	311	135	92	80	113	167	92	52

---

[1] Areas of involvement in "Other" were private piano, clinic work in secondary schools, supervision and evaluation, State Department of Education, curriculum development, editorial staff, therapy, supervising research, elementary coordination, college musician, educational research, applied brass, brass choir, music consultant, project "Fine Arts," State consultant of music, and consultant of special education.

reported in Table I. Such apparent inconsistencies as seven persons who teach in grades 1-6 reporting program responsibilities at the graduate level arise from the fact that these persons also reported themselves having responsibilities at the college level.

As a group, the participants had substantial professional experience in the field of music education (see Table II). The reader may note that six out of seven participants had more than five years in the music education profession. The modal number of years of experience was between 14 and 17 years with a fifth of the group reporting more than 21 years. As an aside, it may be regarded as encouraging that a topic such as behavioral objectives attracted so mature a group of music educators.

TABLE II
YEARS OF POSTBACCALAUREATE PROFESSIONAL
EXPERIENCE IN MUSIC EDUCATION

No. Years	No. Participants	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	1	.5	.5
1	1	.5	1.0
2	6	2.7	3.7
3	11	5.0	8.7
4	10	4.5	13.2
5	3	1.4	14.6
6-7	16	7.2	21.8
8-9	15	6.8	28.6
10-11	25	11.3	39.9
12-13	18	8.1	48.0
14-17	39	17.6	65.6
18-21	36	16.2	81.8
22-25	18	8.1	89.9
26-30	12	5.4	95.3
31-40	9	4.1	99.4
More than 40	2	.9	100.3
Totals	222		

Consistent with the maturity of this group, most participants reported at least one or more courses in their professional training which gave some attention to curricular planning. Only 15 persons indicated that they had taken no courses dealing with curriculum planning (see Table III). It should be noted that although

TABLE III
NUMBER OF COURSES CONCERNED WITH CURRICULUM
PLANNING TAKEN BY THE PARTICIPANTS

No. Courses	No. Participants	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	15	6.8	6.8
1	16	7.2	14.0
2	47	21.1	35.1
3	38	17.1	52.2
4	29	13.1	65.3
5	28	12.6	77.9
6-10	33	14.9	92.8
11 or more	12	5.4	98.2
No response	4	1.8	100.0

most of the group said curriculum planning had been included in their professional preparation only a few more than half of the participants (57 percent) reported any experience in the use of behavioral objectives prior to the workshop (see Table IV).

TABLE IV
PARTICIPANTS' PRIOR EXPERIENCE WITH BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES

Experience	No. Participants	Percent
Some	127	57.2
None	94	42.3
No response	1	.5

TABLE V
PARTICIPANTS'REASONS FOR ATTENDING TRAINING SESSION

Reason	No.	Percent
1. Research Interest	62	27.9
2. Curriculum Improvement	37	16.7
3. Learn About Behavioral Objectives	34	15.3
4. Self-Improvement	31	14.0
5. New Ideas in Music Education	24	10.8
6. Improve Teaching	15	6.8
7. Improve Teacher Training	11	5.0
8. Evaluation	2	.9
9. Miscellaneous	3	1.4
10. No Response	3	1.4

Some responses that exemplified the categories listed above were:

I wanted to learn more about research in music education. (1)
I wanted to effectively apply the latest information in curriculum structure to my own activities. (2)
I want to know more about the use of behavioral objectives in curriculum planning. (3)
I feel the need to update my own philosophy. (4)
I wanted to become more aware of the new trends in teaching. (5)
I hope to increase my knowledge in the area and put these ideas into action in my teaching. (6)
I intend to be involved, on the college level, with the training of music educators and the analysis of methods. (7)
I thought it would deal in part with new techniques of music education evaluation. (8)
I wish to report on this session in the Music Educators Journal. (9)

In summary the participants were predominantly college faculty members or graduate students with a median of about 13 years of postbaccalaureate professional experience in music. Most of the group had taken some formal course work dealing with curriculum planning although for many the use of behaviorally stated objectives was a new concept. By-and-large the participants seemed to be open to the potential benefits that behaviorally stated objectives might have to their research or teaching as reflected in their reasons for attending the RTP session.

F. Development and Analysis of the Evaluation Instruments

The underlying principle in the evaluation of any experience is conceptually straightforward - decide what the desired outcomes of the experience are to be and determine the extent to which the outcomes have been achieved.

Moving from the general principle, the decision was made to assess the objective outcomes of the RTP sessions in terms of grwoth or change in participant responses based on presession and postsession tests of knowledge and attitudes.

Using instructional materials prepared by the principal instructor, along with statements appearing in the RTP project proposal and statements of music behaviors provided by the instructional staff, the evaluation consultant prepared a number of pre- and posttest items for the examination and review of the RTP instructional staff. These items were scrutinized, and organized into the pre- and posttest instruments appearing in the Appendix.

Following administration of the pre- and posttests at the individual RTP session, the instruments were forwarded to an evaluation team consisting of the project evaluation consultant approximately a dozen doctoral students in music education and two faculty members at the Pennsylvania State University. This evaluation team carefully examined each set of instruments, established coding schemes for "free response" questions, and determined procedures for reporting the results from individual RTP sessions as well as for the overall summary report. Because the data provided by the participants was used as an opportunity for the doctoral students to confront and determine appropriate analyses for this type of data, special attention was given to such concerns as inter-judge agreement and coding accuracy. The validity of the findings and results of the statistical analyses were supported by the fact that the majority of the evaluation team had participated in at least one of the RTP sessions and had received extensive exposure to the literature on the uses of behaviorally stated objectives in instructional planning.

A complete summarization of the pre- and posttest responses from the 222 participants who attended the six RTP sessions is provided in the following section of the report.

IV. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

A. Changes in Information About Behaviorally Stated Objectives

One of the two major pre-posttest comparisons concerned a change in the participants' understanding of the content of the workshop. To this end several of the questions on the pre- and posttests were identical and directed toward information provided either through written materials or through oral presentations.

One of these items is reproduced as follows:

Listed below are several examples of objectives written by teachers of music. Place a i, II, or III before those objectives that you believe are stated in Type I, Type II, or Type III behavioral terms. Place an N before these objectives that you believe are stated in nonbehavioral terms.

a. The student will know the letter names of the grand (great) staff.
b. The student will explain why he likes a certain style of music.
c. The student will know the key signatures of the sharp and flat keys.
d. The student will recognize bass clef and treble clef tones on the piano.
e. The student will be able to perceive and recognize theme and variations and rondo forms.
f. The student will discriminate between the same passage as played on the flute and on the oboe.
g. The student will be able to play a V7-I cadence on the piano in any key.
h. The student will know the distinction between tonic and dominant chords.
i. The student will memorize all major and minor key signatures.
j. The student will explain the musical characteristics of a particular record just purchased for his collection.

Table VI presents the pre-posttest comparisons of the participants' ability to correctly identify Type I, II, and III behavior objectives (see Page).

The reader will note that for every statement there was a positive gain. In some cases the gains were in the order of 10 percent (statement a, c, an i) probably due to the relatively high number of correct responses on the pretest; in other cases the gains were in the order of 50 percent (statements b, e, and j). The net gain figures were calculated by subtracting correct response to each item on the pretest from correct response to the identical item on the posttest. Participants had the greatest difficulty with item f, probably resulting from the use of the verb "discriminate". There may have been some

TABLE VI
IDENTIFICATION OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE STATEMENTS

Statement	Pretest														
						Totals							Totals		
	NR		I	II	III	Right	Wrong	NR	N	I	II	III	Right	Wrong	Net Gain
a	15	90*	49*	17	11	139	43	0	58*	105*	12	7	163	19	24
b	26	8	21	66*	61	66	116	0	1	5	165*	11	165	17	99
c	16	85*	52*	20	9	137	45	0	58*	105*	10	9	163	19	26
d	25	27	62*	51	17	62	120	0	7	148*	11	16	148	34	86
e	24	26	46*	50	36	46	136	1	4	146*	20	11	146	36	100
f	25	9	48*	50	50	48	134	0	3	119*	39	21	119	63	71
g	27	14	36	33	72*	72	110	0	0	6	11	165*	165	17	93
h	20	60*	49*	42	11	109	73	0	42*	117*	15	8	159	23	50
i	16	96*	40*	17	13	136	46	0	76*	79*	14	13	155	27	19
j	27	15	26	50*	64	50	132	0	0	1	165*	16	165	17	115
Totals[2]	221	430	429	396	344	965	955	1	249	831	462	277	1548	272	683

---

[2] The St. Louis conference (N=40) was not included in Table VI because those participants erroneously received an earlier version of the pretest which asked only for a dichotomous classification into behavioral (B) or nonbehavioral (N) objectives. Hence, Table VI is based upon the Washington, Eugene, Honolulu, Mobile, and Fargo conferences (N=182). Responses marked with an asterisk (*) are the correct response. NR = No response. N= Nonbehavioral statement. I = Type I behavior: covert, nonverbal. II = Type II behavior: overt, verbal. III = Type III behavior: overt, nonverbal.

question as to whether "discriminate" meant only covert discrimination by the student (Type I) or a verbal expression of the discrimination by the student (Type II).

There was a highly significant increase in the participants overall ability to identify and classify behavioral objective statements. The total of the gain scores was from 865 (35 percent) on the pretest to 1548 (70 percent) on the posttest. Each participant's pretest score for the ten statements was subtracted from his posttest score to yield his gain score. The mean gain score for the distribution of one hundred and eighty-two participants was 3.8. A correlated t test yielded a value of 18.75, significant beyond the .001 level.

In addition to identifying correctly bahavioral objectives the participants were asked in a second series of questions to generate their own examples of Type I, II and III behavioral statements in the domain of music. After establishing satisfactory interrater agreement, the "open ended" responses were rated on a three-point scale (correct, partially correct, incorrect).

The results of the pre-posttest scoring are reported in Tables VIIa, VIIb, and VIIc. The data in these tables are organized to emphasize shifts in participant responses from pre- to posttest. A somewhat detailed description of the data represented in Table VIIa is provided to guide the reader's interpretation of these and following similarly organized tables.

TABLE VIIa
PARTICIPANTS' ABILITY TO WRITE EXAMPLES OF
TYPE I BEHAVIORAL STATEMENTS
(COVERT, NONVERBAL, COGNITIVE AFFECTIVE)

	Posttest							
PRETEST	Incorrect N	%	Partially Correct N	%	Correct N	%	Totals N	%
Incorrect	15	7	7	3	64	29	86	39
Partially Correct	6	3	3	1	20	9	29	13
Correct	8	4	8	4	91	41	107	48
Totals	29	13	18	8	175	79	222	100

The reader will note that 107 of the 222 participants (48 percent) were to have written correct examples of Type I behavioral statements on the pretest. Of this number, 91 persons also wrote correct examples of Type I behaviors on the posttest. The remaining 16 persons who wrote correct statements on the pretest wrote statements on the posttest which are judged to be only partially correct (N=8) or incorrect (N=8).

Twenty of the 29 persons who wrote partially correct behavioral statements on the pretest improved their examples and were judged to have written correct examples on the posttest. Three of the nine remaining participants wrote posttest statements which were only partially correct and six persons regressed to statements which were judged incorrect.

Probably the most encouraging shift observed is reflected by 64 of the 86 participants, who originally wrote incorrect statements, submitting correct statements on the posttest. A small number (N=7) moved from incorrect to partially correct statements and a few participants (N=15) continued to be unable to produce behavioral statements to the end of the training session.

Overall the row and column totals show a significant growth in the ability to generate acceptable examples of Type I (covert, nonverbal, cognitive or affective) behavioral statements from pretest (row totals) to posttest (column totals).

TABLE VIIb

PARTICIPANTS' ABILITY TO WRITE EXAMPLES OF
TYPE II BEHAVIORAL STATEMENTS
(OVERT, VERBAL)

	Posttest							
PRETEST	Incorrect		Partially Correct		Correct		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Incorrect	6	3	4	2	47	21	57	26
Partially Correct	1	0	6	3	20	9	27	12
Correct	8	4	9	4	121	55	138	62
Totals	15	7	19	9	188	85	222	100

TABLE VIIc

PARTICIPANTS' ABILITY TO WRITE EXAMPLES OF
TYPE III BEHAVIORAL STATEMENTS
(OVERT, NONVERBAL)

	Posttest							
PRETEST	Incorrect		Partially Correct		Correct		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Incorrect	9	4	4	2	46	21	59	27
Partially Correct	3	1	3	1	15	7	21	9
Correct	7	3	3	1	132	59	142	64
Totals	19	9	10	5	193	87	222	100

Table VIId provides a summary of the preceding three tables (see Table VIId). The reader will not- a substantial increase in the participants ability to give correct examples of each type of behavioral objective. For all three questions the shift from incorrect to partially correct or correct during the workshop was significant beyond the .01 level.

Participants showed greatest improvement in their ability to write Type I statements; there were thirty-one percent more correct responses on the posttest than on the pretest. On both Type II and III statements there were twenty-three percent more correct responses on the posttest than on the pretest.

TABLE VIId
PARTICIPANTS' ABILITY TO WRITE EXAMPLES OF BEHAVIORAL STATEMENTS--TOTALS

	Posttest							
PRETEST	Incorrect N	Incorrect %	Partially Correct N	Partially Correct %	Correct N	Correct %	Totals N	Totals %
Incorrect	30	5	15	2	157	24	202	30
Partially Correct	10	2	12	2	55	8	77	12
Correct	23	3	20	3	344	52	387	58
Totals	63	9	47	7	556	83	666	100

Thirty percent of the pretest responses were incorrect; only nine percent of the posttest responses were incorrect. This shift from incorrect to correct or partially correct responses was statistically significant (.01 level of confidence).

A third item, related to the instructional content of the workshop, concerned the participants' understanding of certain key terms (Behavior, Learning, Cybernetic Cycle). The participant's responses to these terms were "open ended" in form and were scored on a three-point scale (correct, partially correct, or incorrect). For each concept there was a decrease in the number of incorrect responses from pretest to posttest, significant beyond the .01 level (see Table VIIIa, Table VIIIb, and Table VIIIc).

The reader will note that despite the overall gains for the entire group some individuals who were judged to have given correct or partially correct answers on the pretest gave responses on the posttest which were judged as incorrect. Fortunately the number of such shifts was not large and well within normal regression expectations.

The final question designed to measure participant ability to understand the subject matter of the workshop asked them to describe, in outline form, an "in-life" project model. Because the "in-life project" concept was expected to be unfamiliar to most participants at the beginning of the RTP session, this question was not included in the pretest.

TABLE VIIIa

EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS' DEFINITIONS OF THE CONCEPT, BEHAVIOR

	Posttest							
PRETEST	Incorrect		Partially Correct		Correct		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Incorrect	13	9.8	7	5.3	15	11.4	35	26.5
Partially Correct	5	3.8	16	12.1	24	18.2	45	34.1
Correct	3	2.3	9	6.8	40	30.3	52	39.4
Totals[3]	21	15.9	32	24.2	79	59.9	132	100.0

TABLE VIIIb

EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS' DEFINITIONS OF THE CONCEPT, LEARNING

	Posttest							
PRETEST	Incorrect		Partially Correct		Correct		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Incorrect	19	14.4	12	9.1	10	7.6	41	31.1
Partially Correct	7	5.3	38	28.8	16	12.1	61	46.2
Correct	2	1.5	2	1.5	26	19.7	30	22.7
Totals	28	21.2	52	39.4	52	39.4	132	100.0

TABLE VIIIc

EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS' DEFINITIONS OF THE CONCEPT, CYBERNETIC CYCLE

	Posttest							
PRETEST	Incorrect		Partially Correct		Correct		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Incorrect	25	18.9	22	16.7	13	9.9	60	45.5
Partially Correct	4	3.0	19	14.4	17	12.9	40	30.3
Correct	2	1.5	3	2.3	27	20.4	32	24.2
Totals	31	23.4	44	33.4	57	43.2	132	100.0

---

[3] This question was unintentionally omitted from the posttest for the Washington and St. Louis conferences. Therefore, the data in Tables VIIIa, VIIIb, and VIIIc are based on responses from the other four conferences.

After establishing two model answers, each response was scored on a three-point scale (correct, partially correct, incorrect). The summary data from each of the individual RTP sessions as well as from the total group of participants are shown in Table IX.

The accuracy of each response was determined by the extent of its correlation with the criterion model. The responses scored as incorrect had no obvious correlation with the criterion models. Of those scored partially correct, the most common omissions were "evaluation" and "concepts needed to complete the project."[4]

In comparing the various groups, participants at Washington and Fargo demonstrated the greatest ability to write correct models. The St. Louis and Eugene groups were less able to write correct models. The highest percentages of incorrect models were shown by the Washington and Mobile groups; the lowest percentages were in the St. Louis and Fargo groups.

Of the total group, eighty-four percent were able to write models which were judged correct or partially correct; only sixteen percent wrote incorrect models.

TABLE IX
EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS' EXAMPLES OF "IN-LIFE" MODELS

	Incorrect		Partially Correct		Correct		Totals
	N	%[5]	N	%	N	%	N
Washington	12	24	16	32	22	44	50
St. Louis	3	7.5	26	65	11	27.5	40
Eugene	4	13	20	64	7	23	31
Hawaii	6	19	15	47	11	34	32
Mobile	8	22	17	46	12	32	37
Fargo	3	9	16	50	13	41	32
Totals	36	16	110	50	76	34	222

---

[4]
Model A:
1. Name the product.
2. Describe the specific characteristics of the product.
3. List objects, patterns, arrangements, procedures, knowledge, understandings, and skills necessary.
4. Identify behaviors that will evidence the product.
5. Develop step by step episodes.
6. Evaluation.

Model B:
1. State the project.
2. State the concepts needed to complete the project.
3. State the behavioral outcomes.
4. Describe the method of reaching the outcomes.
5. Measure and evaluate the outcomes.

[5] Percentages are based on the number of participants for each group; the total percentage is based on the total number of participants in all groups (222).

B. Changes in Attitudes Toward Behavioral Objectives

A second major dimension of the evaluation instrument concerned shifts in participants' attitudes toward the use of behavioral objectives in instructional planning as well as certain other attitudes toward music instruction.

Although a substantial majority of the participants were favorably disposed toward the importance of behavioral objects at the beginning of the session there was a significant shift toward even more positive attitudes by the close of the workshop (beyond .01 level). The shift was particularly apparent between modestly supportive responses on the pretest to unqualified positive responses on the posttest.

TABLE X
PARTICIPANTS' BELIEFS REGARDING VALUE OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES[6]

	Posttest							
PRETEST	NR	a	b	c	d	e_1	e_2	Totals
NR	2	0	0	0	6	1	0	9
a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
c	0	0	0	4	22	1	2	29
d	3	0	0	2	130	3	15	153
e_1	0	0	2	1	5	1	1	10
e_2	0	0	0	0	9	1	8	18
Totals	5	0	2	7	175	7	26	222

---

[6] Item: I believe the following with respect to behavioral objectives in education:

Responses:
a. They are of little or no value in any aspect of music instruction.
b. They have some value in performance but little or no value in appreciation or aesthetic instruction.
c. They have some (modest) value in assessing learning in both performance and aesthetic instruction.
d. They represent an important technique for evaluation of music education.
e. None of the above accurately describes my feelings. I believe behavioral objectives have the following relationships to music learning: ______.

e_1 = irrelevant comment
e_2 = combination of a, b, c, or d
NR = No response.

A second item designed to assess shifts in attitude toward behavioral objectives, also indicated a favorable initial attitude which became even more positive as the workshop progressed.

TABLE XI
PARTICIPANTS' ATTITUDINAL SHIFTS REGARDING THE USEFULNESS OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES FOR MUSICAL LEARNINGS[7]

	Posttest					
PRETEST	NR	a	b	c	d	Totals
NR	1	0	0	1	3	5
a	0	0	1	0	1	2
b	0	0	1	9	6	16
c	1	0	4	36	44	85
d	0	0	4	16	105	125
Totals	2	0	10	62	159	233[8]

On the pretest, one hundred and twenty-five participants chose the most favorable response. On the posttest, there were one hundred and fifty-nine responses in this category, a gain of thirty-four.

Of the one hundred and three pretest responses in the a, b, and c categories none appeared on the posttest and in the a category seventy-two appeared in the b and c categories, indicating a posttest shift to d.

Of the five who did not respond on the pretest, two did not respond on the posttest and three shifted to a highly favorable attitude.

On the posttest 68 percent chose the most favorable response, d. There were no responses in the a category, four percent in the b category, and 27 percent in the c category. Thus, about 31 percent expressed some concern over applying and adapting behavioral objectives to most dimensions of musical learning. The 62 posttest c responses indicate a positive attitude toward adapting behavioral objectives to music education.

---

[7] Item: Behavioral objectives:

Responses:
a. Tend to exaggerate the mechanical or manipulative aspects of musical learning.
b. Are useful for evaluating manipulative aspects of music but are not appropriate for evaluating musical learning in its totality.
c. Are essential if musical learnings are to be assessed.

[8] Eleven persons marked two responses.

A third item designed to identify attitude shifts attempted to assess the relative importance of behaviorally stated learning outcomes for instructional planning. As with the prior questions there was a significant shift toward more positive attitudes during the workshop (see Table XII).

TABLE XII

PARTICIPANTS' ATTITUDINAL SHIFTS REGARDING THE NEED FOR STATING LEARNING OUTCOMES IN BEHAVIORAL TERMS WHEN ENGAGED IN INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING[9]

	Posttest					
PRETEST	a	b	c	d	NR	Totals
a	181	1	0	1	1	184
b	25	5	0	1	1	32
c	0	0	0	0	0	0
d	1	0	0	0	0	1
NR	3	1	0	0	1	5
Totals	210	7	0	2	3	222

Less than five percent of the participants expressed some doubt on the posttest as to the importance of behavioral statements of learning outcomes. Two of these participants demonstrated a favorable attitude on the pretest, as did two other participants who did not respond on the posttest.

The following two items were included to assess general attitudes of the participants toward the "wants" of learners and toward in-school and out-of-school musical experiences in instructional planning.

---

[9] Item: The statement of learning outcomes in behavioral terms:

Responses:
- a. Should be an essential consideration in all instructional planning.
- b. Is sometimes helpful but should not dominate planning considerations.
- c. Represents a relatively minor consideration in instructional planning.
- d. Has little or no relevance to instructional planning.
- NR No response.

TABLE XIII
PARTICIPANTS' ATTITUDINAL SHIFTS REGARDING TEACHING AND LEARNING[10]

	Posttest						
PRETEST	a	b	c	d-1	d-2	NR	Totals
a	1	1	2	0	4	0	8
b	1	55	7	0	5	1	69
c	0	22	17	0	14	0	53
d-1	0	4	2	1	2	0	9
d-2	1	29	4	2	41	1	78
NR	0	3	1	0	0	1	5
Totals	3	114	33	3	66	3	222

The authors of the instrument were surprised by several of the participants' responses to this item. The popularity of response c, for example, is difficult to explain on any logical basis since response a describes a point of view which assigns planning responsibility entirely to the teacher. Response b, on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of "learner-specified outcomes" instructional planning. The fact that 33 persons at the end of the workshop still could not recognize this distinction raises certain questions about the clarity of the item or the instruction on this point. A sizable number of participants on each occasion declined to affirm either extreme positions and chose instead to describe some middle ground reconciling the two ideas (response d-2). Overall, however, there was a significant shift to the b response which was to be expected if the instructional emphasis of the workshop was accepted by the participants.

---

[10] Item: I believe the following about teaching and learning:

Responses:
a. Because of his professional expertise, the teacher is responsible for selecting the outcomes of instruction; the learner is expected to accommodate to these teacher-specified outcomes.
b. The wants of the learners should be the basis for setting instructional outcomes; the teacher should adapt his instruction to accommodate these learner-specified outcomes.
c. The two concepts are interchangeable.
d. None of the above corresponds with my belief. I believe ________________. (d-1, irrelevant; d-2, reconciliation of a and b)
NR = No response.

One of the points of interest to the instructional team concerned the degree to which participants would accommodate to student interests as a means of motivation. As one dimension of this broad issue, a specific question asked the participants to indicate their attitudes toward the use of out-of-school music in planning in-school music experiences.

As has been shown with each of the other attitudinal items, there was a significant (.01 level) shift in responses toward the point of view encouraged by the instructional staff. The reader will note that some individuals initially choosing response b moved toward a compromise of responses a and b. A mich more pronounced trend, however, was to move from an initial position of compromise, to an unambiguous choice of response b.

TABLE XIV
PARTICIPANTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD IN-SCHOOL MUSIC PROGRAMS AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL MUSIC EXPERIENCES[11]

	Posttest				
PRETEST	a	b	c-1	c-2	Totals
a	3	3	0	4	10
b	0	76	3	17	96
c-1	0	5	2	3	10
c-2	0	43	3	55	101
NR	0	3	0	2	5
Totals	3	130	8	81	222

---

[11] Item: I believe the following with respect to in-school music programs and out-of-school music experiences:

Responses:
a. The music instruction provided in schools should be based on standard, established instruments, compositions, and structures; little or no special attention need be given to new forms (rock, soul, etc.) in the in-school program.
b. Music instruction in schools should be closely related to the kinds of out-of-school experiences learners have with music.
c. Neither of these positions describes how I feel about the relationship between in-school and out-of-school music. I feel ______________(c-1, irrelevant; c-2, compromise of a and b.)

NR = No response.

TABLE XV
PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS CONCERNING EXPERIENCE AND LEARNING OF MUSICAL CONCEPTS[12]

	Posttest					
PRETEST	a	b	c-1	c-2	NR	Totals
a	156	4	2	6	0	168
b	10	6	3	1	1	21
c-1	2	0	1	0	0	3
c-2	11	1	1	7	0	20
NR	6	2	0	1	1	10
Totals	185	13	7	15	2	222

The large majority of the participants believed prior to - and at the conclusion of - the training session that personal aural experience with music is necessary for the formulation of musical concepts.

Of the fifty-four subjects not subscribing to this view on the pretest, nearly 60 percent of them changed their posttest response to indicate that they were in agreement with the view that personal aural experience with music is necessary for the formulation of musical concepts. This shift was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

C. Participants' Goals and Recommendations

As one of the summary questions in the posttest, the participants were asked to indicate the extent to which their originally declared objective for attending the RTP session (as reported on the pretest) had been realized. The responses were first divided into broad categories expressing (a) satisfaction that the participants' goal had been realized, (b) dissatisfaction that their goal had not been realized, (c) indecision, and (d) failure to respond. Because not all participants addressed themselves to the same objective on the porttest as had been mentioned on the pretest, the first two responses were further divided into those responses which appeared to correspond to the previously expressed goal and those responses which did not. All responses are reported in Table XVI.

---

[12] Item: I believe the following with respect to experience and learning:

Responses:
- a. Musical concepts (such as rhythm, harmony, pitch) are fundamentally aural and cannot be learned without personal experience with musical phenomena.
- b. Although personal experience with musical phenomena is useful in music learning, students can learn musical concepts without such experience.
- c. Neither of these statements accurately expresses my belief about music experience and learning. I believe ______________________________ .

(c-1 irrelevant; c-2 compromise of a and b)
NR = No response.

TABLE XVI
PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS REGARDING THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEIR OBJECTIVES FOR ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE WERE ACHIEVED

		Statement											
		Goal Realized				Goal Not Realized							
		Corr[13]		No Corr		Corr		No Corr		Undecided		No Response	
	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Washington	50	35	70	8	16	3	6	2	4	2	4	0	0
Eugene	31	21	67	4	13	5	16	0	0	1	3	0	0
St. Louis	40	32	80	1	3	2	5	4	10	1	3	0	0
Hawaii	32	19	58	6	19	4	13	0	0	1	3	2	6
Mobile	37	21	57	3	8	6	16	1	3	4	11	2	5
Fargo	32	24	76	1	3	3	9	0	0	3	9	1	3
Totals	222	152	68	23	10	23	10	7	3	12	5	5	2

Overall approximately two-thirds of the participants felt their original goal in attending the workshop had been satisfactorily achieved. This group, combined with another 10 percent who said that some other goal (previously unmentioned) had been achieved, provide a substantial endorsement for the effectiveness of the workshop. A small number of participants indicated they had not expected the workshop to be so narrowly focused and were apparently interested in research techniques which could be put to use immediately. The reader will note some variation in responses to this question from one RTP session to another.

As a final question the participants were asked whether or not they could recommend this type of training session to a colleague with interests and background similar to their own. Only thirteen persons either would not commit themselves or said "no" to this item (see Table XVII). Among the small number of "no" responses, specific reasons varied from statements expressing lack of applications to their concerns, to statements indicating that no new ideas had been presented. Taken in perspective, however, it would be difficult to imagine an instructional experience of this type which could reach every participant.

---

[13] Corr: Indicates that the response corresponded to that tiven in the pretest; No Corr indicates that the response did not correspond to that given in the pretest.

Among the 94 percent who said they could recommend the training session, specific reasons varied from such highly personalized explanations as having a chance to work with Dr. Woodruff to such braod comments as, "the sessions were very stimulating." Table XVII represents the comments of the participants codified according to the principal contribution attributed to the workshop experience.

D. In Summary

It must be concluded that the RTP sessions were an unqualified success. On every dimension the participants showed a significant increase in information about - more positive attitude toward - and endorsement of - the use of behavioral objectives in planning music learning experiences for students. There were, of course, some variations in responses from individual training sessions created by differences in participant background, changes in instructional procedures and materials, and that intangible quality of group dynamics. Overall, however, the results of the six sessions were quite similar and show no particularly revealing differential trends. Data from individual training sessions were tabulated and are available upon request from the MENC National Headquarters, c/o of the Project Coordinator.

TABLE XVII
RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON EXPERIENCES IN TRAINING SESSION

Recommendation	No. of Responses	%
1. Behavioral Objectives contfibute to:		
a. Learning Process	53	21.9
b. Evaluation of Learning	32	13.2
c. Research	12	6.6
d. Curriculum	30	12.4
e. Achievement	9	3.7
2. Contact with Woodruff	12	5.0
3. Miscellaneous[14]	77	31.8
4. No Response	7	2.9
5. No (would not recommend)	6	2.5
Total N =	242	100.0

---

[14] Representative statements from the Miscellaneous category are given below:

Yes, because it not only clarified my own teaching, but will help me to better teach music based on satisfying the human need for music.

Yes, because I don't see how any more work can be effectively done without training of this sort (and more and more)

Yes, because I think that it is possible to use this approach in our teaching--should upgrade the profession.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary of Significant Findings Based Upon the Data

As indicated earlier in this report, the training sessions sought initially to develop three capabilities: (1) the ability to write educationally useful statements of each of the significant kinds of musical behaviors which might be cultivated through education, (2) the ability to identify component parts of a musical behavior required for its operation at a given level of proficiency, and (3) the ability to prepare statements of instructional objectives for given levels of competence in specified musical behaviors to serve as referents for their research in curriculum development and evaluation.

No attempt was made to explore systematically all possible evidences of musical behavior, although a number of discrete musical behaviors were examined as exemplars of categories. Rather, attention was focused upon three types of behavior: (1) covert, nonverbal, cognitive-affective type, (2) overt, verbal type, and (3) overt, nonverbal (motor) type.

The data gathered indicated that the training sessions were highly effective in developing the ability to write educationally useful statements of musical behaviors. The biggest gain occurred with covert, non-verbal, cognitive-affective type behaviors, a frequently neglected category when exploring objectivity in music education.

The Project also proved to be reasonably effective in achieving its second objective: developing the ability to identify the component parts of a behavior required for its operation at a given level of proficiency. Only sixteen per cent of the participants failed to reach minimum competency in this ability. The means for obtaining this data also demonstrated the effectiveness of the RTP in achieving its thrid objective. One can conclude that the RTP was effective in developing the capability to prepare statements of instructional objectives which could serve as referents for research in curriculum development and evaluation.

In addition to the stated objectives of the RTP session, the data indicated that participants developed a highly positive attitude toward the importance of stating music education outcomes in behavioral terms. This shift was observed when such objectivity was related to musical learning and to instructional planning. A large shift in attitude was observed in favor of using the "wants" of learners as a basis for instructional planning and in favor of relating music instruction in the schools to out-of-school experiences with music.

B. Staff Conclusions Not Based on Pre - Post Test Data

Participant experience in the pre-conference training program had an immediate effect upon research studies in progress. A doctoral candidate and his research advisor from a major university in the New York area were both participants and described changes which were being planned in several research studies as a direct result of the pre-conference participation. A similar situation occurred where a candidate from the Pacific Northwest attended the Oregon pre-conference, her advisor the Honolulu pre-conference and both subsequently agreed on needed cbanges in the study in progress. Individual candidates and advisors made a number of similar remarks at various pre-conferences.

Numbers of the participants reflected very strongly that their training experience had met their needs. Members of the staff were asked to participate in similar pre-conference sessions organized at the state and local level. Several staff members made plans to participate in such activity. The project staff discouraged more interest in attempts to replicate the activity because it was evident that additional training was needed before participants were capable of staffing like programs.

Numbers of music educators not involved as applicants or participants became aware of the pre-conference program through distribution of the announcement, through personal contact with participants at the subsequent professional association conventions and through the article in the May, 1969 issue of the Music Educators Journal describing the pre-conference. Many of these music educators asked for the instructional materials for self-study; others expressed the desire to have the pre-conference activity duplicated locally and regionally; still others asked for organization support in the development of publications and curriculum at institutions of higher education and in school systems. The pre-conference program stimulated large scale general interest among music educators in the subject matter at the program.

Groups of participants organized projects in school systems, institutions of higher education and through state associations to engage in further developmental work producing statements of identified musical behaviors and instructional objectives in music education. State-wide activities were organized in Kentucky, Michigan and Florida involving professional associations and state departments of education. There appears to have been a substantial multiplier effect.

There seemed to be little advantage gained from organizing participants into groups as a criterion for selection. The amount of group work scheduled during the pre-conferences was substantially reduced during the course of the several separate pre-conferences in order to insure more individual accomplishment. There does not appear to have been any significant relationship between the amount of group activity during the pre-conference and subsequent further activity by participants to engage in developmental work.

Attitudes formed by the participants during the pre-conference seemed to have been a significant factor relating to the degree of satisfaction and subsequent self-study. Response from participants to staff during personal conversations and at the open discussion sessions revealed some significant overall attitudes among various groups of participants. Several of the pre-conferences were marked by very strong positive responses from the majority of participants. Several other pre-conferences were marked by no overall coherent participant response and/or mild to weakly positive response with some strong minority expressing negative response. Factors which appear to have affected group attitudinal responses include fatigue (as in the case of the post-conference), lack of strong leadership among the participant group members, homogeneity of interest and experience among participants in a group, increased concentration of input early in the training program and similar matters.

C. Recommendations

It is strongly recommended that a subsequent pre-conference training activity be planned for the same group of participants. It was apparent that additional training was necessary to provide experience in preparing statements of instructional objectives for given levels of competence in specified musical behaviors. The fact that numbers of participants have immediately applied their experience in research, research guidance and subsequent research training indicates the need to extend the competence of the participant group.

It is recommended that future training activities of a similar nature not be based upon a selection procedure utilizing a structured attempt to enlist organized participant groups. The procedure makes participant selection much more complex with no demonstrable advantage in the development of post training activity.

It is recommended that the Office of Education make provision for forward funding of pre-conference training programs. The amount of time available between notification of grant award and the first scheduled pre-conference training session was approximately thirty days which is far too little time to accomplish formal solicitation of applications, selection of participants, notification of successful applicants and confirmation of acceptance. The scheduled dates of national and regional professional conferences are established several years in advance. Arrangements regarding such dates and locations are not flexible. While the advantage of securing participant involvement in supported training of high priority without incurring transportation or participant support obligations is very great, the overall effect of such advantage is substantially reduced when individual potential participants cannot make personal plans sufficiently in advance of the scheduled activity.

It is recommended that the pre-conference training session model be exploited more fully by the federal government, state government, institutions of higher education and professional associations as a most effective method of introducing small increments of high priority in-service professional training.

APPENDICES
(Index)

Appendix A-1 - Staff of Preconference Project Page 28
Appendix A-2 - Participants in Preconference Project Page 29
Appendix A-3 - Location and Schedule of Preconferences Page 35
Appendix A-4 - Work Program for Preconference Page 36
Appendix B-1 - Information Announcement Page 47
Appendix B-2 - Invitation to Apply Page 50
Appendix B-2a - Information Sheet for Application Page 51
Appendix B-3 - Application (one of six) Page 53
Appendix B-4 - Participant Notification Page 55
Appendix B-4a - Information Sheet for Participants Page 56
Appendix B-5 - Rejection Notice Page 57
Appendix C-1 - Pretest Information Page 58
Appendix C-2 - Posttest Information Page 63

Appendix A-1

STAFF OF PRECONFERENCE PROJECT

MUSIC EDUCATION RESEARCH COUNCIL
RESEARCH TRAINING PROJECT
Various Sites
Winter and Spring 1969

Project Director:	James Carlsen School of Music University of Washington Seattle, Wash. 98105
Associate Director:	Robert G. Petzold Professor of Music Ed. Assistant Dean School of Education University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Principal Instructor:	Asahel Woodruff Professor of Psychology & Research University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah
Project Evaluation Specialist:	Robert Lathrop Professor of Educational Psychology Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pa.
Project Coordinator:	Charles O. Moody Deputy Executive Secretary Music Educators National Conf. 1201 - 16th St., N.W. Washington, D.C.
Staff Specialist in Music Education:	Frances M. Andrews, Head Music Education Dept. Professor, Music Education Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pa.
Staff Specialist in Music Education:	Paul R. Lehman Professor of Music Education University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky

Division Conference Directors

Jack Heller (Eastern)
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Charlotte E. DuBois (Southwestern)
Professor of Music & Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

George W. Lotzenhiser (Northwest)
Director
Division of Creative Arts
Eastern Washington State College
Cheney, Washington

James Hanshumaker (Western)
Chairman
Music Education
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Robert W. John (Southern)
Professor of Music
University of Georgia
Athens, Ga.

Erwin Schneider (North Central)
School of Music
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

PARTICIPANTS

I. Washington, D.C., Hilton Hotel, January 28-30:

Edward H. Thiebe
1321 Bradley Road
Springfield, Ma. 01118

Thomas Vasil
3 Billings St.,
Acton, Ma. 01720

A. Peter Costanza
234 Bradley Ave.,
State College, Pa. 16801

Mary L. Romanek
Apt. 6-S Graduate Circle
University Park, Pa. 16802

Donald W. Roach
37 Atherton Hall
University Park, Pa. 16802

H. Faith McNitt
Pearl and Logan
Reedsville, Pa. 17084

Rudolf E. Radocy
116 Clover Road
State College, Pa. 16801

Maxine E. Webber
570 Prospect St.,
New Haven, Conn. 06511

Catherine A. Wade
Old Route 6
Hampton, Conn. 06247

Robert K. Revicki
43 Beechwood Road
West Hartford, Conn. 06107

Walter R. Ihrke
25 Storrs Heights Road
Storrs, Conn. 06268

Lloyd J. Schmidt
Ball Hill Road
Storrs, Conn. 06268

Lenore M. Pogonowski
3001 Branch Ave.,
Washington, D.C. 20031

Americole R. Biasini
8000 Park Crest
Silver Spring, Md. 20910

Helen L. Lightner
175 West 76th St.,
New York, N.Y. 10023

Raymond B. Bliss
7 Seton Rd.
Larchmont, N.Y. 10538

Craig Timberlake
200 West 58th St.,
New York, N.Y. 10019

Helen P. Puncheon
80 Berry St.,
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15205

Veronica C. Panizza
618 Clyde St.,
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213

Stephanie Miller
1338 Paoli Pike
West Chester, Pa. 19380

Charles A. Sprenkle
904 Fern Hill Rd.
West Chester, Pa. 19380

Frederick C. Pflieger
841 South New St. Rd.
West Chester, Pa. 19380

Sydney Poretz
5001 Danbury Court
Bethesda, Md. 20014

Mary M. Mylecraine
4111 Brooks Dr., Apt. 201
Suitland, Md. 20023

Hortense P. Taylor
7616 Alaska Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20012

Emma Jane Mitchell
800 - 4th St., S.W. Apt. 802S
Washington, D.C. 20024

Wilbert A. King
2304 Apple Hill Rd.
Alexandria, Va. 22308

Warren W. Shelley
15 Acorn Circle
Towson, Md. 21204

Elsbet Wayne
397 Partridge Rd.
Pittsfield, Ma. 01201

Virgilio Mori
29 Meadow Rd.
Augusta, Main3 04330

Richard Eugene Strange
1212 Mifflin Ave.,
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15218

David P. Willoughby
327 Lemon St.,
Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022

William D. Waite
16 Palisade Lane
Barrington, R.I. 02806

Martin W. Harner
Armstrong St.,
Peekskill, N.Y. 10566

Herbert L. Schultz
102 Iroquois Ave.,
Essex Junction, Vt. 05452

Jeffrey G. Ellinwood
7 Justine Place
Succasunna, N.J. 07875

Camille R. Macdonald
2847 Gillingham St.,
Philadelphia, Pa. 19137

Donald L. Panhorst
R.D. 1
Edinboro, Pa. 16412

Robert H. Cathcart
2600 Stephenson Dr.,
Grendon Farms
Wilmington, Delaware 19808

Reginald H. Fink
1655 Ellis Hollow Rd.
Ithaca, N.Y. 14850

Jacklin B. Stopp
137 West Winspear Ave.,
Buffalo, N.Y. 14214

Harold G. Connell
5011 Weber St.,
Annandale, Va. 22003

David H. Lepard
950 No. Pleasant, St., Apt. 60
Amherst, Ma. 01002

Kevin T. Downs
Taylor Avenue
Wyalusing, Pa. 18853

Anastasio A. Rossi
101 Locust St.,
Thornwood, N.Y. 10594

J. David Boyle
131 West South Hills Ave.,
State College, Pa. 16801

Thomas H. Hill
3931 Fairview Dr.,
Fairfax, Va. 22030

Melvin Platt
8059 Fairfax Rd.
Alexandria, Va. 22308

Kirk M. Dunklee
171 Cedar Dr.,
Massapequa, N.Y. 11758

Alicia I. Pagano
10109 Parkwood Dr.,
Bethesda, Md. 20014

II. St. Louis, Missouri, Chase Park Plaza Hotel, March 3-5:

Gillian Buchanan
Box 117
Portales, N.M. 88130

Catherine F. McHugh
1701 West Center St.
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

Arnold B. Perris
4610 Redfield Court
St. Louis, Mo. 63121

Mary Ann Vaughan
3523 - 49th St.
Lubbock, Texas 79413

Alex H. Zimmerman
306 Hitt St., Apt. 8F
Columbia, Mo. 65201

Donald L. Linde
4718 S. Knoxville St.
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135

Gerald Whitney
3719 S. Indianapolis St.
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135

Charles T. Eagle, Jr.
Route 5, Box 14
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

LeRoy E. Esau
2406 N. Van Buren St.
Hutchinson, Kansas 67501

Paul A. Haack
730 Lawrence Avenue
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Genevieve F. Hargiss
2503 Missouri St.
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Eugene I. Holdsworth
1503 East 18th St.
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

William W. Sears
542 Schwarz Road
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Evelyn H. Davis
7106 East 53rd Place So.
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145

Margaret S. Haynes
2551 Cypress Avenue
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

James A. Middleton
4652 S. Norwood St.
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135

Howard L. Bell
10500 East 72nd St.
Raytown, Mo. 64133

Harvey E. Maier
8332 Ensley Lane
Leawood, Kansas 66206

Sister Mary Tobias Hagan
6400 Minnesota St.
St. Louis, Mo. 63101

Lewis B. Hilton
1335 Purdue St.
University City, Mo. 63130

Roger W. Warner
7620 Carleton St.
St. Louis, Mo. 63130

Wesley S. Coffman
607 Little Creek St.
Duncanville, Texas 75116

James Craig Smith, Jr.
9126 Troulon St.
Houston, Texas 77036

Patricia Y. Bond
3959 Sherwood Forest Dr. #158-E
Dallas, Texas 75220

Richard R. Bentley
2907 Foxcroft Circle
Denton, Texas 76201

William S. Casey
2907 Mt. Carmel St.
Waco, Texas 76710

Evelyn A. Cuthbert
1919 Mistywood St.
Denton, Texas 76201

Cynthia Ruth Merrill
822 College St.
Cleburne, Texas 76031

Edna H. Phillip
125 A Palo Blanco St.
San Benito, Texas 78586

C. Edward Brookhart
7213 Waterline Rd.
Austin, Texas 78731

Warren E. George
4110 Cat Hollow St.
Austin, Texas 78731

Gordon R. Goodwin
1106-E Brackenridge Apts.
Austin, Texas 78703

Gay K. Gouaux
8408 Tecumseh St.
Austin, Texas 78753

Mary S. Smith
3906 Spicewood Springs Rd.
Austin, Texas 78759

William N. Reeves
2295 Glenwood Dr.
Boulder, Colo. 80302

Benjamin Dunham
4600 S. Four Mile Run
Arlington, Va. 22204

Gordon T. Sandford
721 Spruce St.
Boulder, Colo. 80302

Paul F. Roe
1207 Clover Lane
Denton, Texas 76201

Rollie Heltman
State Director of Arts
New Mexico State Dept. of Ed.
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Ralph King
Dept. of Music Ed.
College of Music
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colo.

III. Eugene, Oregon, Eugene Hotel, March 16-18:

David Wallace
395 North High St.
Monmouth, Oregon 97361

Gerald M. Reding
2300 Scarff St., Apt. 9
Los Angeles, Ca. 90007

Mildred S. Gibbens
4211-Gardner Road, S.E.
Salem, Oregon 97302

Marvin L. Belfort
759 Leonard St.
Ashland, Oregon 97520

Sylvia L. Howard
3145 S.W. Ridgewood
Portland, Oregon 97225

George Russell Ross
Route 5, Box 43
Ellensburg, Wash. 98926

Edward S. Lee
4422 East Norwich
Fresno, Ca. 93726

Sydney Fox
1531 Stoddard Ave.,
Thousand Oaks, Ca. 91360

Jeanne Moore
2365 Arbutus Rd.
Victoria, B.C., Canada

Robert F. Noble
709 Short Place
Laramie, Wyoming 82070

D. Rex Yocum
3445 Essex Rd.
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Jay A. Andrews
204 North 6th St.
Cheney, Wash. 99004

Ruth R. Carr
406 N. 5th St.
Cheney, Washington 99004

Jacqueline Rose Dinsmore
2315 Eastmont Way West
Seattle, Wash. 98199

Ronald G. Johnson
2575 - 4th West
Seattle, Wash. 98119

Carol E. Rathe
5616 University Way, N.E. #3
Seattle, Wash. 98105

Bessie R. Swanson
4204 Eleventh Avenue, N.E. #7
Seattle, Wash. 98105

Clifford C. Cunha
10205 N.E. 24th St.
Bellevue, Wash. 98004

Jack A. Taylor
3241 S. 161st St.
Seattle, Wash. 98188

Raymond W. Thompson
9710 - 8th St., N.E.
Seattle, Wash. 98115

Esle R. Faust
207 Harvard Court
Salem, Oregon 97302

Jerry Weseley Harris
3682 Stanley Lane South
Salem, Oregon 97302

Shirley J. Kanupp
703 Howe St.
Dallas, Oregon 97338

Viola Boeckelheide
4549 "D" St.,
Sacramento, Ca. 95819

Larry M. Pember
7532 - 126th St. N.E.
Kirkland, Wash. 98033

Barbara C. Reeder
880 N.W. 134th St.
Seattle, Wash. 98177

Robert M. Trotter
1975 Potter St.
Eugene, Oregon 97405

Leland Lillehang
18815 Tilson Ave.
Cupertino, Ca. 95014

Gary Martin
970 East 37th St.
Eugene, Oregon 97405

IV. Honolulu, Hawaii, Hilton Hawaiian Village Hotel, March 27-29:

Barbara L. Andress
4434 West El Camino
Glendale, Arizona 85301

Allen E. Clingman
3235 Quesnel Dr.
Vancouver 8, B.C. Canada
Annette W. Cochrane
1123 Pakini St.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Elneta A. Cooper
Music Dept.
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Marian F. Demand
936 Terrace Rd.
Tempe, Arizona 95281

Paul E. Eickmann
490 Kendrick Rd.
Rochester, N.Y. 14620

William S. English
244 E. Concorda Dr.
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Charles B. Fowler
300-A Third St. S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

Fay S. Gartin
1076 Berkeley
Turlock, Ca. 95380

Dorothy K. Gillett
5521 Opihi St.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821

Marvin Greenberg
2085 Ala Wai Blvd.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Walter L. Haderer
2645 Martinez Dr.
Burlingame, Ca. 94010

Edna M. Hehn
3451 Dimond Ave., Apt. 11
Oakland, Ca. 94602

H. Brent Heisinger
1315 Avalon Dr.
San Jose, Ca. 95125

Harold T. Higa
1610 Paula Dr.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Miriam B. Kapfer
3165 Brazos St.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Alvina N. Kaululi
3817 Kaimuki Ave.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Alice S. Knuth
323 S. Stadium Dr.
Monmouth, Oregon 97361

William Knuth
P.O. Box 117
Monmouth, Oregon 97361

Virginia R. Krueger
1001 Bayshore Dr.
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

Betty J. Lahman
2230 S. Overlook St.
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

James Mason
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84601

Mildred M. McBride
3194 Alika Ave.,
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Keiko S. Narahara
45-336 Koa Kahiko St.
Kaneohe, Hawaii 96744

Robert E. Nye
2510 Woodland Dr.
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Ouida Fay Paul
5740 Haleola St.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821

Elaine M. Shakley
21100 Almar Dr.
Shaker Heights, Ohio 44122

Donald J. Shetler
86 Woodline Dr.
Penfield, N.Y. 14526

James Sjolund
Route 6, Box 286-A
Olympia, Wash. 98501

Helen M. Smith
Chairman, Music Dept.
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, Ca. 91711

Chester A. Stone
55467 Moana St.
Laie, Hawaii 96762

Malcolm J. Tait
Hawaii Curriculum Center
1625 Wist Place
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

George C. Wellington
430 Kailua Rd.
Kailua, Hawaii 96734

David Brian Williams
P.O. Box 3628
Agana, Guam 96910

V. Mobile, Alabama, Admiral Semmes Hotel, April 13-15:

Connie L. Hepler
P.O. Box 805
Whiteville, N.C. 28472

Albert L. Stoutamire
714 Lothian Dr.
Tallahassee, Fla. 32303

Donald R. Goss
P.O. Box 129
Martin, Tenn. 38237

John W. Rhodes
702 Sixth Ave.,
Eastman, Ga. 31023

Michael D. Bennett
372 Wallace St.,
Memphis, Tenn. 38117

Cleora D. Bewley
Box 7
Evergreen, Ala. 36401

Wilfred G. Mears
703 Faculty St.
Boone, N.C. 28607

Philip M. Paul
P.O. Box 421
Boone, N.C. 28607

Joseph C. Logan
Route 1, Box 110-A1
Boone, N.C. 28607

Richard R. Armstrong
Box 2718 Southern Station
Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401

Merton S. Zahrt
Box 353 Southern Station
Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401

Gomer J. Pound
1004 N. 31st Ave.,
Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401

Robert F. Wermuth
5757 Summit Ave.
Mobile, Ala. 36608

James B. Andrews
Box 153
Hurricane, W. Va. 25526

Robert D. Peterson
98 West Lincoln St.
Buckhannon, W. Va. 26201

Elbert E. Morton
Box 207
Shepherdstown, W. Va. 25443

Tom W. Watson
3205 Kiwanis Dr.
Bowling Green, Ky. 42101

R. Bernard Fitzgerald
2087 Old Nassau Rd.
Lexington, Ky. 40504

Robert W. Surplus
228 Magnolia Dr.
Richmond, Ky. 40475

Jean T. Craig
112 Hammons Dr.
Richmond, Ky. 40475

E. Glenn Fulbright
Route 3, Box 1073
Morehead, Ky. 40351

William M. Bigham
214 Jackson Place
Morehead, Ky. 40351

David L. Wilmot
1232 N.W. 36th Dr.
Gainesville, Fla. 32061

William D. Claudson
820 Watt Dr.
Tallahassee, Fla. 32303

William F. Cramer
2112 Great Oak Dr.
Tallahassee, Fla. 32303

Robert E. Glotzbach
2118 Great Oak Dr.
Tallahasse, Fla. 32303

Richard M. Graham
U-6 Callaway Garden Apts.
Athens, Ga. 30604

John Solomon Edwards
130 W. Cloverhurst Ave.
Athens, Ga. 30601

Rose M. Kolpatzki
684 Timm Valley Rd., N.E.
Atlanta, Ga. 30305

Olin G. Parker
212 Fortson Dr.
Athens, Ga. 30601

Kenneth H. Robinson
100 Mohican Circle
Boca Raton, Fla. 33432

Peggy Joyce Barber
4250 S.W. 10th St.
Ft. Lauderdale, Fal. 33314

Fred W. Vorce
2127 Oxford Rd.
Tallahassee, Fla. 32304

Martin R. Rice
309 Pineville Rd.
Spartanburg, S.C. 29302

Jacqueline H. Melnick
52 Amherst Rd.
South Hadley, Ma. 10075

Charles L. Gary
1 Santa Maria Court
McLean, Va.

VI. Fargo, North Dakota, Townhouse Motor Inn, April 23-25:

Edgar M. Turrentine
1222 West Minnehaha Parkway
Minneapolis, Minn. 55419

Franz L. Roehmann
3401 - 45th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minn. 55406

Robert E. Hallquist
3462 Harriet Court
St. Paul, Minn. 55112

Robert L. Borg
600 University Avenue, S.E.
Minneapolis, Minn. 55414

Karen M. Landsness
4704 West 62nd St.,
Minneapolis, Minn. 55424

Shari Ann Steffen
4813 West 40th St.,
St. Louis Park, Minn. 55416

Marion M. Knudsen
3111 - 40th Place
Des Moines, Iowa 50310

Betty M. Kanable
3211 - 30th St., B-9
Des Moines, Iowa 50310

James O. Froseth
4905 Knox Lane
Madison, Wis. 53711

Roger J. Folstrom
622 Charles Lane
Madison, Wis. 53711

Virginia Chambers
1005 Gilbert Rd.
Madison, Wis. 53711

William B. Tietze
1285 Union
Platteville, Wis. 53818

Ronald D. Thompson
655 North Court St.
Platteville, Wis. 53818

Michael George
6005 Piping Rock Rd.
Madison, Wis. 53711

Richard F. Zellner
109 Acewood Blvd.,
Madison, Wis. 53714

Robert Swan
4701 Flint Lane
Madison, Wis. 53714

Herbert H. Henke
124 Woodhaven Place
Oberlin, Ohio 44074

B. Neil Davis
1510 Lewis Drive
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

James E. Wallis
1906 E. 105th St., Apt. 2
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Joseph C. Robinson
187 South Main
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022

Lois Ann Mittleman
1541 East 191st St., Apt. 202
Euclid, Ohio 44117

Warren F. Prince
3561 East Scarborough
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118

Keith P. Thompson
5500 Warwick Dr.
Parma, Ohio 44129

Mary E. Friedmann
1393 Giel #14
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

Eleanor Tipton
310 West Alden Place
DeKalb, Il. 60115

Betty J. Holsteen
310 West Alden Place
DeKalb, Il. 60115

M. Lucille Fink
221 Knollwood Dr.
DeKalb, Il. 60115

Gerald D. Buckler
2N-225 Pleasant Hill
Wheaton, Il. 60187

William C. Kirkpatrick
1111 Glidden Ave.,
DeKalb, Il. 60115

Joseph A. Labuta
3472 South Blvd.,
Bloomfield Hills, Mich. 48013

James D. Thomson
14821 Rosemont
Detroit, Mich. 48223

Edwin Gordon
25 Brookfield Dr.
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Robert C. Donald
4413 - 38th St.
Des Moines, Iowa 50310

Charles H. Benner
357 Thrall St.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45220

Gary A. Sigurdson
Interlochen Arts Academy
Interlochen, Mich. 49643

M. Theresa Goodell
230 Quincy St.
Hancock, Mich. 49930

John W. Mitchell
1010 Washington
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

LOCATION AND SCHEDULE OF PRECONFERENCES

DIVISIONS	CITY & STATE	MENC DIVISION CONVENTIONS	PRECONFERENCE
EASTERN: Conn., Del., D.C., Me., MD., Mass., N.H., N.J., N.Y., Pa., R.I., & Vt.	Washington, D.C. Washington Hilton Hotel	Jan. 31-Feb. 3	Jan. 28 - 30
SOUTHWESTERN: Ark., Colo., Kan., Mo., N.M., Okla., & Tex.	St. Louis, Missouri Chase Park Plaza Hotel	March 6 - 9	March 3 - 5
NORTHWEST: Alaska, Ida., Mont., Ore., Wash., & Wyoming	Eugene, Oregon Eugene Hotel	March 19 - 22	March 16 - 18
WESTERN: Ariz., Calif., Hawaii, Nev., & Utah	Honolulu, Hawaii Hawaiian Village Hotel	March 30-Apr. 2	April 3 - 5
SOUTHERN: Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn., Va., and W. Va.	Mobile, Ala. Admiral Semmes Hotel	April 16 - 19	April 13 - 15
NORTH CENTRAL: Ill., Ind., Ia., Mich., Minn., Neb., N.D., Ohio, S.D., and Wisc.	Fargo, N.D. Town House Motel	April 26 - 29	April 23 - 25

Appendix A-4

COPY

PRECONFERENCE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH TRAINING PROJECT IN MUSIC EDUCATION 1969

Work Program

1. DESIRED QUALITIES IN MUSIC EDUCATION

Curriculum Model
(1)

A. A curriculum--K-12--some set of CONCEPTS and COMPETENCIES that constitute a MUSICAL BASIS OF a full life.

B. CUMULATIVE ACQUISITION of those concepts and competencies--through the several strands of that curriculum.

A high level of acquisition.

RESULT: People engaged in various musical behaviors beyond school.

2. WE HAVE TWO PROBLEMS TO SOLVE

A. The TRANSFER problem: We wish to CHANGE BEHAVIOR NOW -- accumulate a spectrum of music behaviors that carry on beyond school.

e.g. Perceiving/recognizing music and musical things
Conceiving/developing concepts of music
Deciding/choosing effectively in musical situations
Discussing/criticizing music intelligently
Organizing/arranging musical phenomena
Performing/making music
Etc.

Currently: We are not getting this.
We get: 1. Verbal information -- easily lost -- ineffective in life.
2. Limited performance skills -- often inappropriate for later life

B. The MOTIVATION problem: Inducing ANIMATED, SELF-SUSTAINED, CONFIDENT learning, with INCREASING INTEREST, MOTIVATION, APPRECIATION.

Currently: Problems:
1. Music is "expendable" not a basic part of every person's life. Public motivation is low.
2. Only a few students have real musical motives. Others see it as a social device. Many are not interested.
3. Music stirs relatively few of those who study it. We do not stir dynamic response in the general student.

Appendix A-4

C O P Y

3. THE SOLUTION REQUIRES THREE PARALLEL STRANDS OF ACTION

Three Parallel Tasks
(2)
(No handout)

A. Redesign SUBJECT MATTER into BEHAVIORAL form.
B. Redesign the INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM in matching behavioral form.
C. Redesign the EVALUATION SYSTEM for BEHAVIORAL measurement, feedback, revision, and experimentation.

4. THE FIRST TWO LINES OF ACTION CAN BE UNDERTAKEN TOGETHER

A. The BASIS: The nature of behavior and its change process.

We propose: To SHOW you some of the basic characteristics of behavior.
We want you to SEE THEM, literally, to promote understanding of why traditional education practices are not producing the results we want, and AT THE SAME TIME, recognition of ways of redesigning them so they will.

5. HUMAN BEHAVIOR

A Man-Environment Interaction (3)

A. It is a MAN-ENVIRONMENT INTERACTION -- a continuing CYCLE.

e.g. How do you get acquainted with a new person? Home? Piece of music?

The Shaping Process (3) - Overlay

B. The interaction SHAPES BOTH THE MAN AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

Man-environment Interaction Model (4)

C. The shaping process has TWO VITAL LOOPS.

Response Types and Substances (5)

Cognitive Cycle (6)

D. The man's loop operates as a CYBERNETIC CYCLE.

Meaning and Feeling (7)

E. FEELINGS are being shaped along with MEANINGS, and CONDITIONED PATTERNS.

F. If you BREAK THE LOOP, you STOP THE SHAPING PROCESS.

How the School Interrupts Learning (8)	The school interrupts learning, rather than facilitating it.
	The FLAWS:
Subject Matter Aspects of Environment (9)	1) It removes the person from the real environment of his life.
Examples of Music Objectives (10) p. 1 (No transp.)	2) It presents subject matter to him largely in abstract verbal form.
	3) His learning activities consist dominantly of receiving and trying to retain verbal information without adequate petceptual foundations.
Stage Shift (No handouts) Curriculum Shift (No handouts) (11)	4) It engages him in an interaction with a teacher rather than with his life environment.
Emerging and Existing Concepts (12) (No transp.)	5) It thus breaks the man-environment interaction cycle in which behavior is shaped by its consequences.

6. LEARNING

A. A RESULT of BEHAVING.

Learning as a By-Product (13) Human Adjustive Behavior (13A) Learning: A Set of ... (--_ (No handout) The Nature of the "Carrier Project" Model (14) (No transp.) Illustrative Examples of *Types* of Carrier Projects (15) Three Models of Instruction (16)	1) In its most potent form, learning is always a by-product of an attempt to produce or acquire something to satisfy a want. It is an ADJUSTIVE PROCESS. We set out to GET SOMETHING, not to learn. We LEARN WHILE WE ARE GETTING IT. i.e., We learn whatever we *have* to learn, to reach our goal.
	2) The models of ADJUSTIVE behaviors and LEARNING BEHAVIORS are different.
	3) Learning is a BRIEF DETOUR to acquire an essential concept or competence.

7. USING THE ADJUSTIVE BEHAVIOR MODEL IN EDUCATION

A. Make education an INTERNSHIP IN LIVING,
Under intensive COACHING
Get the power of the real learning cycle.

Appendix A-4

COPY

B. How? First we must ask a very basic question:

Curriculum as a Spectrum
(1) (Repeat)

If you have succeeded in making a person musically alive and literate, WHAT WILL HE THEN BE DOING -- ???

Examples (10) p. 3

At his present age -- also,
After he leaves school --

Illustrative Examples (15)
(No transp.)

PRACTICE: Name several such behaviors (Realistic ones)

Other Examples in Other
Fields (18) (No transp.)
Others (19) (No transp.)

C. When WE know what those behaviors are, then we can get students involved in them IN SCHOOL for learning purposes.

The device: Put students to work acquiring or producing ONE OF THE PRODUCTS that satisfy personal wants, under conditions that FORCE THEM TO LEARN while they are doing it.

This device is a LEARNING VEHICLE -- it will carry learning along with it.

We can call it a CARRIER PROJECT.

8. CRITERIA OF AN EDUCATIONALLY USEFUL CARRIER PROJECT

A. It is a task which plays a vital role in people's lives -- it is likely that many persons will engage in it.

Describing history	vs	Enjoying a concert

B. It requires far-reaching concepts and competencies for its completion.

Producing drumsticks	vs	Arranging a song for trio

C. It is one in which instructional help is essential for effective learning. (Leave others to be acquired outside of school)

Singing a popular song in a skit	vs	Harmonizing a melody

9. STEPS IN FORMULATING A CARRIER PROJECT

Turn to the set of steps and worksheets.

C O P Y

WORKSHEET 1

NAMING AND DESCRIBING A PRODUCT TO BE PRODUCED

(This is to be something a STUDENT wants to produce--not something YOU want him to produce which he does not find personally attractive. You might help him identify something that catches his genuine interest or he might identify it by himself. How he identifies it is not important as long as he really wants it once he becomes aware of it.)

NAME THE PRODUCT:

LIST ANY CHARACTERISTICS OR SPECIAL QUALITIES THE STUDENT WANTS IT TO HAVE (He and the teacher must agree on them):

Examples: A Product: A chest of drawers.
Characteristics: Two drawers
Four cubic foot capacity
Wax finish
Free of scars
Smooth action of drawers

A Product: Piano performance with an orchestra
Characteristics: Play from memory
Free of error
Fully coordinated with conductor

Test the product as follows:

1. Does it meet criterion Number 1, on page 24, of A Teaching Behavior Code?
2. Does it meet criteria 1 and 2 on page 24 of the Code?
3. What makes you think any student would want to produce it?

ADW
2/4/69
3/8/69

C O P Y

WORKSHEET 2

TASK ANALYSIS

To be able to produce any product, the person must use certain objects, processes, patterns, arrangements, customs, steps, and so on that play immediate parts in that production. He may also have to perform certain motor competencies (Type III D behaviors). This worksheet is to identify them. (Consult First Steps in Building A New School Program, pp. 40-41.)

Write the name of the product here:

LIST 1. What objects, processes, patterns, arrangements, customs, or steps will he have to use? List only those that are essential. Identify them by name only. (E.g. a hammer, a bunson burner, the steps for assembling a valve.)

LIST 2. What instrumental motor acts (Type III D behaviors) if any, will he have to perform with some degree of motor skill? List only those that are essential, and list them by name only. (E.g. trim a reed, insert a pad under heat, apply a critical amount of pressure to a wrench)

ADW
2/4/69
3/8/69

COPY

WORKSHEET 3

ANALYSIS OF A REFERENT FOR TEACHING PURPOSES

Before a teacher can present a referent to a student for becoming familiar with it, he must know its critical properties so he can present them, and eliminate related but irrelevant and noncritical properties. A carefully written conceptual statement is intended to consist of those critical properties, and no others. See First Steps in Building a New School Program, pp. 43-48, on the "Nature of Conceptual Statements," on "Data," on "Identifying a Referent," and on "Vocabulary." This worksheet is to identify those critical properties and plan for presenting them to the student. Follow these steps:

1. Write one of the items from List 1, of Worksheet 2.

2. Circle which of the following it is:
   Object or structure, process, act-consequence sequence.
   See First Steps, pp. 43 and 44 to assist in this identification.

3. List its critical properties. Their general nature is indicated by the descriptions on pp. 43 and 44.

4. Arrange those critical properties into a statement, using the appropriate form as shown on pp. 43-45. The use of those forms will avoid confusion which tends to develop without them.

5. Check your statement against its appropriate form. Some psuedo-conceptual forms are shown on page 45. Be sure you have not written one of them. They do not provide the guidance we need at this point.

6. Usually there is a technical term for each critical property. Those terms should appear in the concept statement. Underline any technical term the students should learn to use as they work with the properties.

7. If the student needs to know and be able to recall any Data (items of factual information) in order to use this concept effectively, list them here. (They can be memorized, or supplied in printed form for reference):

(TURN TO OTHER SIDE)

8. List the media, materials, and working arrangements the student will need as he perceives the critical properties of the referent and becomes familiar with them.

9. Write out the steps by which the learner will interact with the materials and develop his concept of them. (That is, how should he proceed to touch, manipulate, smell, taste, or otherwise interact with the materials for clear and efficient learning?) Try to write out directions he could follow by himself so the unit could be self-administering, even though you might choose to conduct him through it yourself.

10. What Task Administration Pattern do you intend to use for this learning unit? (See A Teaching Behavior Code, p. 35, beginning with paragraph 2, and see also the "Analytical Record of Teaching," p. 46, item 2 under Section 1.)

11. What will you accept as evidence that the student has acquired an adequate concept of the referent? For this purpose you need a Verbal Expression of it (Type II Behavior), or a nonverbal expression of it (Type III Behavior) which cannot be performed without the concept. You may need or want both. Write one or both of them here. (See First Steps, pp. 29-36. Use the statement patterns on pp. 33-36.)

A Verbal Expression (Type II)	A Nonverbal Act (Type III)

COPY

WORKSHEET 4

ANALYSIS OF AN OVERT NONVERBAL MOTOR COMPETENCE FOR TEACHING PURPOSES
(Type III D Behavior)

This worksheet is used to analyze a Type III D performance skill and make a plan for helping a student acquire the skill. Consult First Steps in Building a New School Program, pp. 25-36, with particular reference to Type III D behaviors, the "Instrumental Motor Acts." Follow these analytical steps:

1. Write here one of the items from List 2 of Worksheet 2:
2. Identify its critical and essential components and list them under these subdivisions:
   A. List here the essential identifications, discriminations, choices, and processes the student must carry out in the act:

   B. Are there any acts to be explicitly excluded? If so, name them:

   C. Are there any working conditions that must be observed when the act is being performed? If so, state them:

   D. Are speed, or any similar factors vital? If so, state them"

COPY

3. Combine the components in A to D above into a behavioral statement. The person must be able to:

This statement is now the specification for the skill and will also serve as the criterion for evaluating his learning.

4. List the materials (media, tools, objects of any kind, arrangements) needed by the learner for practicing the act and developing the necessary competence:

5. Write out the sequential steps the learner will go through to develop the act to the required level of competence. Try to write directions he could follow by himself so the unit can be self-administering, even though you might choose to conduct him through it yourself. If he needs to understand any particular characteristics of any of the materials, identify those characteristics (critical properties) and state how he will become familiar with them as you write out the steps.

Appendix B

General Mailings - Participant Selection Process

B-1 Information Announcement

B-2 Invitation to Apply

B-2a Information Sheet for Application

B-3 Application (one of six)

B-4 Participant Notification

B-4a Information Sheet for Participants

B-5 Rejection Notice

COPY

MUSIC EDUCATORS NATIONAL CONFERENCE

A DEPARTMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 Sixteenth Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

October 1, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Society for Research in Music Education and Other Interested Music Educators

FROM: Charles O. Moody, Deputy Executive Secretary

SUBJECT: Informational Announcement About Research Training Project Proposal

THIS ANNOUNCEMENT IS AN INFORMATIONAL ACTIVITY OF THE MENC NATIONAL OFFICE TO ALERT MUSIC EDUCATORS TO THE ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE MERC IN THE PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF THE PROPOSAL DESCRIBED. INTERESTED MUSIC EDUCATORS ARE BEING INFORMED OF THE DATES OF THE PROPOSED PRECONFERENCE TRAINING SESSIONS AND OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PROGRAM IN ORDER TO MAKE SUCH PERSONAL PLANS AS MAY BE NECESSARY ON A CONTINGENT BASIS AND TO PROVIDE THEM AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR INTEREST IN THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY. IT IS EMPHASIZED THAT NO MUSIC EDUCATOR RECEIVING THIS ANNOUNCEMENT OR LEARNING OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN SHOULD CONSTRUE THE ANNOUNCEMENT IN ANY WAY WHICH MIGHT BE INTERPRETED AS PREJUDICIAL TO THE EVALUATION AND GRANT AWARD PROCEDURES AND POLICIES OF THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION.

1. The MERC has submitted a proposal to the United States Office of Education to conduct a series of training, exercises in conjunction with the six Division conventions in early 1969. In order to acquaint members of the Society with the program proposed the abstract which accompanied the proposal follows:

"The proposed Research Training Project will provide a concentrated three-day training experience for between 210 and 240 researchers and users of research in the field of music education. There will be six separate training sessions; one each presented as a preliminary activity immediately preceding each of six regional conventions of the Music Educators National Conference in the spring of 1969. Participants at the preconference training sessions will be organized in teams of three to five individuals including school music teachers, music supervisors and college and university researchers in music education. The 7,000 plus members of the Society for Research in Music Education will be invited to apply and to nominate other team members. Teams will be selected to insure wide geographic representation and the probability of continuing developmental activity at the local level. The principal educational need being served is to provide training in expressing the instructional objectives of music education for research in curriculum development and evaluation. Desired musical behaviors have not been defined precisely in operational terms and music educators are relatively untutored in the knowledge and skills required to accomplish such definitions. The training described in this proposal should yield a population of music educators who can identify desired musical behaviors and define them appropriately. The advantage to subsequent research and development activities in curriculum development and evaluation in music education should be substantial."

2. On the assumption that many members of the Society may be interested in knowing more about opportunities to participate in the Research Training Project a portion of the proposal dealing with participation has been extracted as follows:

> "Participant Selection
>
> A letter describing the Project will be sent to every one of the more than seven thousand members of the Society for Research in Music Education on or around September 15. This informational letter will include extracts from the proposal and will stress the contingent nature of the project pending the receipt of a USOE grant award. Invitations to apply and applications will be sent to individuals who express an interest in the program as a response to the informational mailing. It will be suggested that interested individuals should respond expressing their interest . . . Respondents will be asked to indicate the order of their preference for at least two of the Preconferences. All invitational correspondence and applications will be cleared through USOE staff liaison. Individuals will be invited to apply as members of participant teams. Each participant team will have from three to five members. Teams might include a music teacher in the schools, a music supervisor and/or experienced graduate student in music education and a university or college level music researcher. Individuals unable to identify with potential team members will be invited to apply individually with the understanding that the Participant Selection Committee will assign them to a team. The Participant Selection Committee will consist of the Music Educators on the Instructional Staff plus all six of the Preconference Directors. The principal criteria for selection will be:
>
> a. That individuals can be composed into a team which has a substantial likelihood of continuing to develop curricular and evaluative materials as a small group after the Preconference ends.
> b. That teams consist of individuals who give clear evidence of being able to profit most from the training experience.
> c. That teams represent an appropriate geographic and demographic distribution.
>
> Selected participants will be notified of their selection as soon after November 20 as possible. Teams have been established as the basic trainee unit rather than individuals for several reasons:
>
> a. It is planned that team members should pursue activities based upon the training they have had subsequent to the Preconferences and it is assumed that there is a greater likelihood of this with teams than with individuals.
> b. Both during and following the Preconference it is assumed that the learning of individuals will be maximised by the opportunity to share the competencies represented by individual team members."

3. For those members of the Society interested in possible participation in the scheduled times and places of the Preconferences are listed below:

EASTERN ------- Washington, D. C. - January 31-February 3 - (RTP - January 28-30)
SOUTHWESTERN -- St. Louis, Mo. ---- March 6 - 9 ----------- (RTP - March 3-5
NORTHWEST ----- Eugene, Oregon ---- March 19 - 22 --------- (RTP - March 16-18)
WESTERN ------- Honolulu, Hawaii -- March 30-April 2 ------ (RTP - March 27-29)
SOUTHERN ------ Mobile, Alabama --- April 16-19 ----------- (RTP - April 13-15)
NORTH CENTRAL - Fargo, N. Dakota -- April 26 - 29 --------- (RTP - April 23-25)

Members of the Society who wish to have more information and/or an invitation to apply are requested to fill in the enclosed form, detach and mail to:

Charles O. Moody, Deputy Executive Secretary and
1969 MERC Research Training Project Coordinator-designate
Music Educators National Conference
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE TO HAVE RESPONSES IN WASHINGTON BY NOVEMBER 4 IF POSSIBLE.

- -

1. I wish more information about the proposed 1969 MERC Research Training Project

   a. The objectives ______
   b. The actual content of the training program ______
   c. The probable cost to me as a participant ______
   d. All of these ______

2. I wish to be sent an invitation to apply to the ______ Division Preconference and/or to the ________________ Division Preconference as my second choice.

3. I wish invitations to apply to be sent to the following music educators who may become members of a team with me:

a. ______________________________
Last Name, First Name

____
Street Address (home)

____
City, State, Zip code

____
Home Telephone - Work Telephone

____
Present Work Assignment

b. ______________________________
Last Name, First Name

____
Street Address (home)

____
City, State, Zip code

____
Home Telephone - Work Telephone

____
Present Work Assignment

(Use other side to provide information about additional team members)

4. My name is ______________________________
Last Name, First Name

____
Street Address (home)

____
City, State, Zip code

____
Home Telephone - Work Telephone

____
Present Work Assignment

Appendix B-2

COPY

Music Educators National Conference

A DEPARTMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

1201 Sixteenth Street N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

January 1, 1969

Dear Colleague:

The Music Educators National Conference and the United States Office of Education are sponsoring a series of research training pre-conferences in conjunction with MENC's 1969 Division Conventions. Each pre-conference will be three days in length and will provide intensive instruction for researchers, researchers in training and utilizers of research in music education. The instructional focus of each pre-conference will be upon the identification of musical behaviors and their expression in operational terms. The intent is to provide a preliminary understanding and some practice in order to improve the capability of music educators to develop operational objectives for research and instruction and to understand such objectives where they have been expressed as part of research data and reports.

Music educators from all levels of education are urged to consider application. Individuals are not required to be members of MENC to apply or participate in the pre-conferences. Each individual participant is expected to pay his own transportation, lodging and maintenance during the three days of the pre-conference. Instructional expenses of the pre-conferences are supported by a grant from the Office of Education supplemented by MENC funds. Pre-conference applicants are urged to apply in teams wherever possible. Teams might consist of a public school teacher, a public school supervisor or department chairman and a college or university level researcher. Other teams might consist of graduate student researcher trainees and university level researchers. The principal purpose of establishing teams prior to or at the time of the pre-conference is to provide a basis for continuing instructional self-development following the pre-conference.

I urge you to study the enclosed informational material and to complete and return to the MENC National Office your completed application form as soon as possible. I am most pleased to be able to extend to you this invitation to apply as a participant on behalf of both MENC and the U.S. Office of Education.

My best wishes to you for a happy and productive new year in music education.

Cordially yours,

Charles L Gary

Charles L. Gary
Executive Secretary

OFFICIAL MAGAZINE: MUSIC EDUCATORS JOURNAL

INFORMATION SHEET
USOE - MENC Research Training Pre-Conferences, 1969

C O P Y

I. Application Procedure

Support for the pre-conferences from MENC and the Office of Education is used to defray all costs of instructional materials and instructional staff expense. There are no registration fees or other instructional costs to participants. PARTICIPANTS WILL BE EXPECTED TO PROVIDE ALL TRANSPORTATION AND LIVING COSTS AT THEIR OWN EXPENSE. The instructional opportunity afforded by the pre-conference program is designed to capitalize upon the anticipation that interested persons would have planned to attend the MENC Division Convention. Every applicant is requested to enclose a check for $10.00 made out to the hotel or motel providing accommodation for pre-conference participants at the specific pre-conference for which the applicant is making application. The name of that hotel or motel is found on the application. Each application will be completed by an individual applicant and must be accompanied by a check. Checks will be returned promptly to applicants not selected for participation. Participants who make private arrangements for accommodation at the pre-conference site will be returned their checks at the time of pre-conference registration. All pre-conference applicants are asked to complete that portion of the application regarding hoten registration. Reservations will be made at the pre-conference hotel by the project staff and confirmed by the hotel. Cancellation of reservations may be made up to 15 days prior to the pre-conference. Duplicate notification of such cancellation should be made to the hotel and to the Project Coordinator, Charles Moody, MENC Deputy Executive Secretary, at MENC National Office. Participants may withdraw from the pre-conference up to 15 days prior to the pre-conference. Information about eating arrangements will be distributed at the first meeting of the pre-conference. Pre-conference participants are encouraged to plan to live at the pre-conference site during the pre-conference. Interaction among participants and the need for private study necessitate participant residence at the pre-conference site.

II. Additional Information

A. Instructional Materials

Successful applicants will be sent materials prior to the pre-conference. It is expected that all participants will study such materials carefully. A 30 minute pre-test will be administered to all participants in the opening hour of the preconference.

B. Alternate Applicants

A limited number of applicants will be notified that they have been selected as alternate participants. Alternate participants will be notified by telephone or telegram with confirming letter not less than ten days prior to the pre-conference as to the availability of a participant place. Alternates should make contingent plans accordingly.

C. Notification of Participants

All successful applicants will be notified by the Division Pre-conference Director of their selection as participants approximately 45 days prior to the pre-conference. Unsuccessful applicants will be notified to that effect shortly thereafter.

D. Alternative Pre-conference Choice

Each applicant is asked to indicate whether a second choice of pre-conference is acceptable. At this time the greatest interest is being shown in the Eastern, North Central, Southern and Southwestern pre-conferences. Any individual indicating an interest in a second choice of pre-conference is asked to include a second check for $10.00 made out to the hotel providing the site at the second choice pre-conference (see enclosed list). Where second choice alternatives are supported with hotel checks, the application and check of unsuccessful applicants will be immediately referred to the second choice Division Pre-conference Director and the unsuccessful applicant will be so notified.

E. Team Participation

Although each application must be submitted by a single individual, each application includes space to identify other members of the applicant team. An individual on the team should exercise the initiative to contact other team members to coordinate preparation of the individual applications for team members. It is emphasized that applications and accompanying checks must be mailed by team members as individuals.

F. Selection Criteria

The Music Education Research Council acting as a Participant Selection Committee has established the following factors as the criteria for participant selection. The factors are listed in rank order of applicability:

1. Active Researcher (College or University Professor)
2. State Supervisor
3. Supervisor of Music - City or County
4. Geographic Distribution
5. Teaching Area of Specialization

All factors will be considered in the making of each selection!

G. Scheduling of Pre-conferences

Five of the six pre-conferences are scheduled to occupy the three days preceding the Division Convention. The Western Division Pre-conference is scheduled to follow the Division Convention. Each pre-conference is scheduled to start promptly at 8:45 a.m. on the first day and end at or around 4:30 p.m. on the third day. No formal instructional activities are scheduled in the evenings in anticipating of the need for time to study and possible informal interaction among team members.

Appendix B-3
C O P Y

APPLICATION
U.S.O.E. - MENC Western Division
Research Training Project Pre-Conference
Hawaiian Village Hotel, April 3-5, 1969

I apply to be selected as a participant in the USOE-MENC Western Division Research Training Pre-Conference.

Name(Dr., Mr., Miss, Mrs.) ____________________ Last First Initial
Age ________
Sex ________

Home Address ____________________ Street City State Zip
Tele. No. ________

Work Address ____________________
Tele. No. ________

Present Position ____________________ Title Institution

Highest Degree Held ______ Year awarded ________

Publications and Professional Activities ________
____
____
____

Indicate Approximate Percent of Time

1. Classroom teaching
   - a. Higher Ed. ________
   - b. Elem.-Sec. ________
2. Music Administration
   - a. Curr. Super. ________
   - b. Other Admin. ________
3. Research
   - a. Active Res. ________
   - b. Research Trng. ________

If needed, give the name and address of your administrator to whom a request for release of time should be sent: ________________________

I have enclosed $10.00 in check or money order only made out to the Hawaiian Village Hotel and would prefer the accommodation checked below:

☐ Twin bed in two bedded room @ $11.50-$16.50 per night. (with ____________) For the nights of March 29, 30, 31, Apr. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (Circle desired dates)

☐ Single room @ $21.00-$31.00 per night for the nights of March 29, 30, 31, Apr. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (Circle desired dates)

See next page.

Please respond in one of the spaces below.

☐ 1. I am not applying as a member of a team.

☐ 2. I am applying as a member of a team which includes the people whose names are listed below.

☐ 3. I am the team leader of the team whose members are listed below. I have personally checked to be sure that all listed team members are submitting separate applications.

Other team members:

1.
2.
3.
4.

Please return immediately to Charles O. Moody, Project Coordinator, Music Educators National Conference, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

The deadline for the receipt of completed applications will be noon March 12, 1969

WE CANNOT HOLD HOTEL SPACE AFTER MARCH 1st

COPY

March 12, 1969

This letter is to inform you of your selection as a participant in the Research Training Postconference. Should you find it necessary for any reason to forego participation in the Postconference please call Mrs. Rose Glanz, Project Secretary, at Area Code 202-223-9400, Extension 441 collect immediately.

An Information Sheet has been enclosed together with three items of instructional materials. You are requested to study the Information Sheet carefully and to follow the directions contained therein.

Your selection to participate in the USOE-MENC Research Training Program places you in a select company of about two hundred leading music educators across the country. It is a pleasure to recognize your interest and qualifications. I look forward to meeting you and working with you and your fellow participants in Honolulu. On behalf of the Project Staff, the Research Council, the Office of Education and MENC I offer you our congratulations and best wishes for a rewarding and productive experience.

Sincerely,

Charles O. Moody
Project Coordinator

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS
RESEARCH TRAINING POSTCONFERENCE FOR MUSIC EDUCATORS
Hawaiian Village Hotel, April 3-5

C O P Y

I. Schedule

While the instructional schedule for the Postconference will not be distributed until the first session, participants are directed to present themselves at the Carousel Room of the Hawaiian Village Hotel at 8:30 a.m. Thursday, April 3, to register. The opening session will begin promptly at 8:45 a.m. It is currently planned to conclude the Postconference at 3:30 p.m. on Saturday, April 5. No evening sessions are planned. All participants are expected to attend all daily sessions.

II. Instructional Information

A. Pre and post training tests

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the training session and to provide data to improve the quality of subsequent sessions, a pre-test will be administered to all participants early in the opening session. Near the close of the last session a post-test will be administered to all participants. For this reason early departure from the Postconference is not possible.

B. First Assignment

Each participant is asked to study the enclosed materials carefully. Of the items enclosed, THE TEACHING BEHAVIOR CODE should be read subsequent to study of the other two items. Considerable reference will be made to concepts and data included in these materials early in the sessions. Subsequent instructional materials and presentations are based upon the assumption of prior study of these materials. PLEASE BRING THREE-RING BINDER WITH YOU.

III. Miscellaneous

At this time no meal functions are planned. Dress is optional. The total number of participants will be limited to 36. At the present time it appears that participants will not be able to avail themselves of any currently scheduled charter flights - all of which will be leaving on April 4.

IV. Additional Information

For additional information please contact:

Charles O. Moody
Project Coordinator

or

Rose M. Glanz
Project Secretary

Music Educators National Conference
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Phone: 202-223-9400, ext. 441 ----- (Night line - 202-223-9404)

MUSIC EDUCATORS NATIONAL CONFERENCE

A DEPARTMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 Sixteenth Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

February 11, 1969

I regret to inform you that your application for participation in the Research Training Project conducted by the Music Education Research Council in conjunction with the Southwestern Division Convention of MENC in St. Louis has not been accepted. There were more qualified applicants from the geographic area of the Southwestern Division than there were places available for participants.

While it was realized that the St. Louis site would be more economically feasible for some persons not residents of the Southwestern Division, the decision was made to give priority to members of the Southwestern Division.

In the hope that the alternative will still be a possibility for you I am sending your application to the North Central Division Selection Committee Chairman. Enclosed you will find a card which should be completed immediately and sent with a replacement check to Dr. Erwin Schneider, School of Music, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210. I hope that you can appreciate our regret and understand our reasons for priority being given to Division residents. You will find enclosed the check you sent with your application.

Sincerely,

Charles O. Moody
Project Coordinator

OFFICIAL MAGAZINE: MUSIC EDUCATORS JOURNAL

Appendix C-1

COPY

Code ____ ____ ____ ____ ____

PRETEST

Educational Research Training Project - Music Educators National Conference

The following questions are designed to assess your attitudes toward --and your understanding of--behaviorally stated objectives in music learning. You are urged to be as candid in your responses to these questions as you can.

At the upper right you will find a five digit code number. Please copy this number in your notebook where you can locate it later. At the conclusion of the training session you will be asked to answer a set of parallel questions and the code numbers will allow anonymous pre-post comparisons of your responses.

Part I - Descriptive Data

1. My primary professional responsibilities are (check as many as appropriate in both columns):

Level

___ Grades 1-6

___ Grades 1-8

___ Grades 7-9

___ Grades 9-12

___ College

___ Other: Specify _____

____

Program

___ Vocal (general, choral)

___ Instrumental (band, orchestra)

___ Theory, History, Appreciation

___ Administration

___ Teacher Training

___ Graduate Student

___ Other: Specify _______________

____

2. I have had approximately ________ (number) years of postbaccalaureate professional experience in music education. (Explain, if necessary.) _______________

____

____

3. I have taken ________ (number) courses in music education (or pedagogy) in which some attention was given to curriculum planning.

4. I have had ______ (some) ______ (no) prior experience or training in the use of behavioral objectives in instructional planning.

5. I decided to attend this training session because ____________

____

____

Part II

1. Listed below are several examples of objectives written by teachers of music. Place a B before those objectives that you believe are stated in behavioral terms.

    ___ a. The student will know the letter names of the grand (great) staff.

    ___ b. The student will be able to explain why he likes a certain style of music.

    ___ c. The student will know the key signatures of the sharp and flat keys.

    ___ d. The student will recognize bass clef and treble clef tones on the piano.

    ___ e. The student will be able to preceive and recognize theme and variations and rondo form.

    ___ f. The student will discriminate between the same passage as played on the flute and on the oboe.

    ___ g. The student will be able to play a V^7-I cadence on the piano in any key.

    ___ h. The student will know the distinction between tonic and dominant chords.

    ___ i. The student will memorize all major and minor key signatures.

    ___ j. The student will explain the musical characteristics of a particular record just purchased for his collection.

2. I believe the following with respect to behavioral objectives in education:

    ___ a. They are of little or no value in any aspect of music instruction.

    ___ b. They have some value in performance but little or no value in appreciation or aesthetic instruction.

___ c. They have some (modest) value in assessing learning in both performance and aesthetic instruction.

___ d. They represent an important technique for evaluation of music instruction.

___ e. None of the above accurately describes my feelings. I believe behavioral objectives have the following relationship to music learning: ______________________

____

____

3. Behavioral objectives:

___ a. Tend to exaggerate the mechanical or manipulative aspects of musical learning.

___ b. Are useful for evaluating manipulative aspects of music but are not appropriate for evaluating musical learning in its totality.

___ c. Can be adapted to assess most dimensions of musical learning.

___ d. Are essential if musical learnings are to be assessed.

4. The statement of learning outcomes in behavioral terms:

___ a. Should be an essential consideration in all instructional planning.

___ b. Is sometimes helpful but should not dominate planning considerations.

___ c. Represents a relatively minor consideration in instructional planning.

___ d. Has little or no relevance to instructional planning.

5. I believe the following about teaching and learning:

___ a. Because of his professional expertese, the teacher is responsible for selecting the outcomes of instruction; the learner is expected to accommodate to these teacher-specified outcomes.

___ b. The wants of the learners should be the basis for setting instructional outcomes; the teacher should adapt his instruction to accommodate these learner-specified outcomes.

___ c. The two concepts are interchangeable.

___ d. None of the above corresponds with my belief. I believe the following with respect to instructional objectives

____

____

6. I believe the following with respect to in-school music programs and out-of-school music experiences.

___ a. The music instruction provided in schools should be based on standard, established, instruments, compositions, and structures; little or no special attention need be given to new forms (rock, soul, etc.) in the in-school program.

___ b. Music instruction in schools should be closely related to the kinds of out-of-school experiences learners have with music.

___ c. Neither of these positions describes how I feel about the relationship between in-school and out-of-school music. I feel ______________________________

____

____

7. I believe the following with respect to experience and learning

___ a. Musical concepts (such as rhythm, harmony, pitch) are fundamentally aural and cannot be learned without personal experience with musical phenomena.

___ b. Although personal experience with musical phenomena is useful in music learning, students can learn musical concepts without such experience.

___ c. Neither of these statements accurately expresses my belief about music experience and learning. I believe

____

____

8. The following three terms will arise frequently in the course of the training session. Please describe what you understand each term to mean:

a. Behavior ______________________________

____

b. Learning ______________________________

____

c. Cybernetic Cycle ______________________________

____

9. a. Give an example of a covert, nonverbal, cognitive-affective outcome of a learning experience in music. ______________

____

____

COPY

b. Give an example of an overt, verbal outcome of an instructional experience in music. ____________________

____

____

c. Give an example of an overt, nonverbal outcome of an experience in music instruction. ____________________

____

____

10. Name one specific (personal) objective that you hope to achieve during this training session. ____________________

____

____

RLL/gc
1/14/69

Appendix C-2

C O P Y

Code ____ ____ ____ ____ ____

POSTTEST

Educational Research Training Project - Music Educators National Conference

Now that the training session is completed we would like to assess some of the changes which may have occurred during the past three days. Please place the five digit code number which appeared on your pretest in the space provided in the upper right.

In answering the following questions, please be as candid as possible.

Part I

1. Listed below are several examples of objectives written by teachers of music. Place a I, II, or III before those objectives that you believe are stated in Type I, Type II, or Type III behavioral terms. Place an N before those objectives that you believe are stated in nonbehavioral terms.

___ a. The student will know the letter names of the grand (great) staff.

___ b. The student will be able to explain why he likes a certain style of music.

___ c. The student will know the key signatures of the sharp and flat keys.

___ d. The student will recognize bass clef and treble clef tones on the piano.

___ e. The student will be able to perceive and recognize theme and variations and rondo form.

___ f. The student will discriminate between the same passage as played on the flute and on the oboe.

___ g. The student will be able to play a V^7-I cadence on the piano in any key.

___ h. The student will know the distinction between tonic and dominant chords.

___ i. The student will memorize all major and minor key signatures.

___ j. The student will explain the musical characteristics of a particular record just purchased for his collection.

2. I believe the following with respect to behavioral objectives in education:

___ a. They are of little or no value in any aspect of music instruction.

___ b. They have some value in performance but little or no value in appreciation or aesthetic instruction.

___ c. They have some (modest) value in assessing learning in both performance and aesthetic instruction.

___ d. They represent an important technique for evaluation of music instruction.

___ e. None of the above accurately describes my feelings. I believe behavioral objectives have the following relationship to music learning: ____________________
____
____

3. Behavioral objectives:

___ a. Tend to exaggerate the mechanical or manipulative aspects of musical learning.

___ b. Are useful for evaluating manipulative aspects of music but are not appropriate for evaluating musical learning in its totality.

___ c. Can be adapted to assess most dimensions of musical learning.

___ d. Are essential if musical learnings are to be assessed.

4. The statement of learning outcomes in behavioral terms:

___ a. Should be an essential consideration in all instructional planning.

___ b. Is sometimes helpful but should not dominate planning considerations.

___ c. Represents a relatively minor consideration in instructional planning.

___ d. Has little or no relevance to instructional planning.

5. I believe the following about teaching and learning:

___ a. Because of his professional expertese, the teacher is responsible for selecting the outcomes of instruction; the learner is expected to accommodate to these teacher-specified outcomes.

___ b. The wants of the learners should be the basis for setting instructional outcomes; the teacher should adapt his instruction to accommodate these learner-specified outcomes.

___ c. The two concepts are interchangeable.

___ d. None of the above corresponds with my belief. I believe the following with respect to instructional objectives ____________________

____

6. I believe the following with respect to in-school music programs and out-of-school music experiences.

___ a. The music instruction provided in schools should be based on standard, established, instruments, compositions, and structures; little or no special attention need be given to new forms (rock, soul, etc.) in the in-school program.

___ b. Music instruction in schools should be closely related to the kinds of out-of-school experiences learners have with music.

___ c. Neither of these positions describes how I feel about the relationship between in-school and out-of-school music. I feel ____________________

____

7. I believe the following with respect to experience and learning:

___ a. Musical concepts (such as rhythm, harmony, pitch) are fundamentally aural and cannot be learned without personal experience with musical phenomena.

___ b. Although personal experience with musical phenomena is useful in music learning, students can learn musical concepts without such experience.

___ c. Neither of these statements accurately expresses my belief about music experience and learning. I believe

____

____

Part II

1. a. Give an example of a covert, nonverbal, cognitive-affective outcome of a learning experience in music. ____________________

____

____

b. Give an example of an overt, verbal outcome of an instructional experience in music. ____________________

____

C O P Y

c. Give an example of an overt, nonverbal outcome of an experience in music instruction. ____________________

2. Describe in a few steps how a music teacher might plan an instructional sequence based on the *"in-life project model."* (Use a simple illustration if possible.)

a. ____________________

b. ____________________

c. ____________________

d. ____________________

e. ____________________

3. The following three terms will arise frequently in the course of the training session. Please describe what you understand each term to mean:

a. Behavior ____________________

b. Learning ____________________

c. Cybernetic Cycle ____________________

Part III

1. On the pretest you were asked to name a specific objective that you hoped to achieve during this training session. Would you now describe the extent to which this objective was (or was not) realized? ____________________

C O P Y

2. In what ways do you feel the arrangements, organization, instruction, practice sessions, or evaluation of the training session could be strengthened or improved to make the program even more useful to further groups? ______________________

3. Knowing now what you know about the training session, would you recommend the experience to a colleague with similar background and interests to your own?

Yes, because ______________________

No, because ______________________

RLL/gc
1/16/69